



**Surrey Heath Borough Council**

Surrey Heath House  
Knoll Road  
Camberley  
Surrey GU15 3HD  
Contact Centre: (01276) 707100  
DX: 32722 Camberley  
Website: www.surreyheath.gov.uk

**Service:** Regulatory Services  
**Our Ref:** 14/0249  
**Officer:** Aneta Manto  
**Direct Tel:** 01276 707222  
**Direct Fax:** 01276 707218  
**Email:** development.control@surreyheath.gov.uk

Mr David Hutchinson  
Pegasus Planning Group  
Pegasus House  
Querns Business Centre  
Whitworth Road  
Cirencester, Gloucestershire  
GL7 1RT

27 November 2014

**TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**

**Town & Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England)**  
**Order 2010**

Application Type: Full Planning Application

Drawing No./Date Stamped: R-0325-6-ISLP, R0325-4-IJ, R-0325-16-1A, R-0325-16-2,  
R-0325-17-1A, 7-1, 7-2A, 7-3, 7-4, 7-5, 7-6, 7-7A, 7-8A, 7-9, 7-10,  
7-11, 7-12, 7-13, 7-14A, 7-15, 7-16, 7-17-1B, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, 6B, 7B,  
8, 7-18, 7-19, 7-20, 7-21A.

The Council as Local Planning Authority **REFUSES** planning permission for the following development for the reason(s) set out in the schedule below:-

**Proposal:** Erection of 113 dwellings with new access from Snowdrop Way and Chatton Row, internal roads, footways, parking, landscaping, open space with other associated works following demolition of the existing factory buildings and areas of hardstanding. (Additional information rec'd 22/09/14), (Amended plans & info rec'd 20/10/14).

**Location:** 17 QUEENS ROAD, (FORMERLY BISLEY OFFICE FURNITURE SITE), BISLEY, WOKING, GU24 9BJ



## REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL

1. Snowdrop Way is a quiet residential cul-de-sac characterised by on-street parked cars; and therefore the development by reason of the proposed access off this road with the associated comings and goings of additional vehicles would result in an intensification in the movement of traffic along this road which would cause disturbance, be unneighbourly and harmful to the residential amenities of the existing Snowdrop Way residents contrary to Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
2. In the absence of a completed legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the applicant has failed to comply with Policy CP12 Infrastructure Delivery and Implementation of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 in relation to the provision of infrastructure contributions towards transport, libraries, community facilities and recycling, in accordance with the requirements of the Surrey Heath Borough Council's 'Planning Obligations and Infrastructure Provision Tariff Scheme'. The proposal would therefore contribute to unacceptable additional pressure on local infrastructure to the detriment of the locality.
3. In the absence of a completed legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the proposal fails to provide an adequate provision of affordable housing, and as such would not deliver a development, which would meet the housing requirement of all sectors of the community. The application is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of Policy CP5 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.
4. In the absence of a completed legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the applicant has failed to comply with Policy CPI4B (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 in relation to the provision of contribution towards 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 2012).



**Informatives:**

1. In relation to reason for refusal 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 comes 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.

The Council confirms that in assessing this planning application it has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive way, in line with the requirements of paragraph 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

*U Rickard*

Executive Head - Regulatory  
Duly authorised in this behalf  
(ATTENTION IS DRAWN TO THE NOTES ATTACHED)



## NOTES TO APPLICANTS

### Appeals to the Secretary of State

- If you are aggrieved by the decision of your local planning authority to refuse permission for the proposed development or to grant it subject to conditions, then you can appeal to the Secretary of State under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
  - If you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision then you must do so within 6 months of the date of this notice (unless your decision relates to an enforcement notice of a minor commercial development – see below).
  - If this is a decision on a planning application relating to the same or substantially the same land and development as is already the subject of an enforcement notice, if you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision on your application, then you must do so within 28 days of the date of this notice.
  - If an enforcement notice is served relating to the same or substantially the same land and development as in your application and if you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision on your application, then you must do so within: 28 days of the date of service of the enforcement notice, or within 6 months of the date of this notice, whichever period expires earlier.
  - If this is a decision to refuse planning permission for a minor commercial application, if you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision then you must do so within 12 weeks of the date of this notice.
- Appeals must be made using a form which you can get from the Secretary of State at Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol BS1 6PN (Tel: 0303 444 5000) or online at [www.planningportal.gov.uk/pcs](http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/pcs).
- The Secretary of State can allow a longer period for giving notice of an appeal but will not normally be prepared to use this power unless there are special circumstances which excuse the delay in giving notice of appeal.
  - The Secretary of State need not consider an appeal if it seems to the Secretary of State that the local planning authority could not have granted planning permission for the proposed development or could not have granted it without the conditions they imposed, having regard to the statutory requirements, to the provisions of any development order and to any directions given under a development order.

### Further advice

- If permission to develop land is refused or granted subject to conditions, whether by the Local Planning Authority or by the Secretary of State and the owner of the land claims that the land has become incapable of reasonably beneficial use in its existing state and cannot be rendered capable of reasonably beneficial use by carrying out any development which has been or would be permitted, the owner may serve a Purchase Notice on Surrey Heath Borough Council. This Notice will require the Council to purchase his interest in the land in accordance with the provisions of Part IV of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- In certain circumstances, a claim may be made against the Local Planning Authority for compensation, where permission is refused or granted subject to conditions by the Secretary of State on appeal or on a reference of the application to him. The circumstances in which such compensation is payable are set out in Section 120 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- This decision notice refers only to the application made and does not convey any other consent or permission. Applicants should satisfy themselves that any other relevant consent is obtained before any work commences. For example: approval under the Building Regulations; consent under the Environment Agency byelaws; the release of any restrictive covenants on the land or permission of any landowners. Attention is drawn to Section 20 of the Surrey Act 1985 which requires that when a building is erected or extended proper provision shall be made for the fire brigade to have means of access to the building and any neighbouring building.
- 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 at [www.surreyheath.gov.uk](http://www.surreyheath.gov.uk). A paper copy can be obtained but there is a charge for this service.



**LOCATION:** 17 QUEENS ROAD, (FORMERLY BISLEY OFFICE FURNITURE SITE), BISLEY, WOKING, GU24 9BJ

**PROPOSAL:** Erection of 113 dwellings with new access from Snowdrop Way and Chatton Row, internal roads, footways, parking, landscaping, open space with other associated works following demolition of the existing factory buildings and areas of hardstanding. (Additional information rec'd 22/09/14), (Amended plans & info rec'd 20/10/14).

**TYPE:** Full Planning Application

**APPLICANT:** Redrow Homes Ltd

**OFFICER:** Aneta Mantio

**RECOMMENDATION:** Defer and Delegate for a legal agreement then GRANT subject to conditions

## 1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of 113 dwellings with new access from Snowdrop Way and Chatton Row, internal roads, footways, parking, landscaping, open space with other associated works following demolition of the existing factory buildings and areas of hardstanding.
- 1.2 This report concludes that the principle of the development is acceptable. The proposal would deliver needed housing in the Borough. It would make use of the previously developed land and therefore would not be inappropriate development within the Green Belt. The loss of employment use is also justified.
- 1.3 Subject to the attached conditions, the development would not result in any adverse traffic generation, highway safety implications, detrimental access arrangements or inadequate parking provision and subject to a satisfactory legal agreement the proposed development would not result in any adverse impact on the local infrastructure. It would not result in any adverse loss of residential amenities to the existing residents or the future occupiers of the development, in any adverse impact on trees, biodiversity, drainage, flooding or character of the wider surrounding area. The proposal is also considered in line with the requirements of the national and local policies in terms of the proposed sustainable measures to be implemented within the scheme. In addition, subject to a satisfactory legal agreement, the proposal would satisfy the local plan requirements in terms of its impact on local infrastructure, affordable housing and SAMM.
- 1.4 As such, the proposal is considered in line with the local plan and the NPPF and is recommended for approval.

## 2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site is located within the village of Bisley. It extends to 4.11ha and comprises of an existing light industry factory that includes a footprint of a large building with extensive areas of hardstanding. The site is of irregular 'L' shape with its northern part, including the majority of the factory building, being within the settlement boundary of the village and the remainder of the site falling outside of the defined settlement and within the designation of the Metropolitan Green Belt.
- 2.2 The site is bounded by residential properties to its east, north and west. The properties to

the east of the application site are pre-dominantly represented by detached dwellings; properties along Queens Road to the north of the factory building are semi-detached; and, the western boundary abuts Snowdrop Way, a residential estate of pre-dominantly linked-detached dwellings built in late 1970s. The northwest boundary to the corner adjacent to Chatton Row abuts the area of low density detached dwellings within the Green Belt location. The southern boundary is adjacent to the designated Site of Nature Conservation Importance known as Bisley Common.

- 2.3 The site slopes slightly down from the north to the south, however the changes in ground levels of maximum of 5m within such a large site are not considered significant. It is bound by mature high conifer hedge to the east, south, west and part of north boundaries and close-boarded fence of various heights in places. Additional mature and semi-mature boundary trees also provide valuable screening of the factory building from the residential properties surrounding the site at present. A brick wall to the western part of the site borders with residential properties in Snowdrop Way. Further trees are located on a strip of land to the west of the factory building, adjacent to the existing car park.
- 2.4 The industrial use developed during its life of over 70 years and currently occupies considerable footprint of approximately 17,800sqm. It is located to the central - north and east parts of the site, with the remainder of the site being used for parking and movement of vehicles.

### 3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1 The application site has a lengthy planning history; however none of the applications are relevant to the current proposal. The applicant entered into pre-application discussions with the Council prior to the submission of the current application.

### 4.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of 113 dwellings with new access from Snowdrop Way and Chatton Row, internal roads, footways, parking, landscaping, open space with other associated works following demolition of the existing factory buildings and areas of hardstanding.
- 4.2 The proposal involves demolition of the existing factory building and of all the associated hardstanding areas. The development would provide 113 dwellings, 45 of which would be affordable and 68 market housing units. The proposed units would be pre-dominantly detached and semi-detached dwellings. 12 residential units would be provided in the form of flats. The proposal splits the site into two character areas. The northern part that lies within the settlement area of the village would be of a higher density of 27.5 dph and would accommodate the aforementioned flats, detached and semi-detached dwellings. The southern part that lies within the designation of the Metropolitan Green Belt would have a lower density of 14 dph and would accommodate larger detached dwellings, LEAP (Local Equipped Area of Play) and a natural play area.
- 4.3 Two of the market units would have an access from Chatton Row, with the remainder being accessed from Snowdrop Way. The existing vehicular access from Queens Road would be closed off. The proposal includes implementation of internal roads, footways, car parking areas & garaging, landscaping, drainage works (including the relocation of the existing watercourse to the southeast part of the application site) with further associated works.
- 4.4 The mix, tenure and the maximum heights of the proposed dwellings are shown in the table below:

|  | Affordable units | Market units | Total | Maximum proposed height (m) |
|--|------------------|--------------|-------|-----------------------------|
|--|------------------|--------------|-------|-----------------------------|

|                  |    |    |     |  |  |
|------------------|----|----|-----|--|--|
| <b>1-bedroom</b> | 6  | 0  | 6   |  | 11.7                                   |
| <b>2-bedroom</b> | 17 | 10 | 27  |  | 11.7 (flats)<br>9 (Evesham house type) |
| <b>3-bedroom</b> | 18 | 9  | 27  |  | 8.4                                    |
| <b>4-bedroom</b> | 4  | 36 | 40  |  | 8.7                                    |
| <b>5-bedroom</b> | 0  | 13 | 13  |  | 9.45                                   |
| <b>Total</b>     | 45 | 68 | 113 |  |  |

4.5 In addition, the proposal is supported by the following documents, which will be referred to where applicable in section 7 of this report:

- Affordable Housing Statement (by Pegasus);
- Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (by Wessex Archaeology);
- Archaeological Evaluation Report (by Wessex Archaeology);
- Design and Access Statement (by Pegasus);
- Energy Statement (by Redrow);
- Environmental Statement (Ecology) (by Pegasus);
- Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary (by Pegasus);
- Environmental Statement Addendum Supplementary Environmental Information (by Pegasus);
- Flood Risk Assessment (by JNP Group);
- Framework Residential Travel Plan (by JNP Group);
- Geo-Environmental Assessment (by Merebrook Consulting);
- Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (by Pegasus);
- Marketing Report (by Lambert Smith Hampton);
- Planning Statement (by Pegasus);
- Statement of Community Involvement (by PPS Group);
- Transport Assessment (by JNP Group);
- Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and draft Tree Protection Plan (by Pegasus); and
- Utilities Report (by JNP Group).

4.6 In accordance with the requirement of the Localism Act 2011, the applicant carried out a public consultation and submitted a 'Statement of Community Involvement' advising on the method of consultation used; who was consulted and the level of involvement; and, how the matters raised in the consultation were addressed by the applicant. The public exhibitions took place on 31/01/2014 and 07/02/2014 with 225 people in attendance, 122 of which provided feedback via the available forms. Along with the feedback received, the residents highlighted importance of protection of and enhancement of the site's boundary with Bisley Common and design of new homes followed by the importance of meeting housing need in the borough and the opening up routes across the site to Bisley Common. However,

concerns in terms of the access to the new development and particularly its impact on Snowdrop Way and a preference of utilising the existing access from Queens Road, as well as the impact of development on community facilities were also raised.

## 5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- |      |   |   |
|------|---|---|
| 5.1  | Surrey County Council<br>Highway Authority      | No objection to the proposal, subject to conditions and informative.  |
| 5.2  | Natural England                                 | Raise objection. Further clarification and comments are outlined in planning considerations below.  |
| 5.3  | Environmental Agency                            | No objection with regards to ground water quality.  |
| 5.4  | Bisley Parish Council                           | Raise objection based on the following issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Does not deliver sustainable development;</li><li>• Contrary to Policies CP1, CP2, CP11, CP12, DM9, DM10, DM11;</li><li>• Loss of Green Belt land &amp; employment.</li></ul>  |
| 5.5  | Surrey Wildlife Trust                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No objection to the proposal in principal. Issues of mitigation for the likely impact on Thames Basin Heath SPA and biodiversity enhancements were raised.</li><li>• No objections were raised to the Addendum to the ES, however suggest compliance with the recommendations of that document.</li></ul> |
| 5.6  | SHBC Drainage Engineer                          | No objection to the proposal, subject to conditions and provision of financial contribution towards a relocation of the existing water course to the southeast of the site.   |
| 5.7  | SHBC Tree Officer                               | No objection to the proposal, subject to conditions.  |
| 5.8  | SHBC Housing                                    | No objections, subject to the provision of affordable housing as outlined in the Affordable Housing Statement.  |
| 5.9  | Surrey County Council<br>Heritage (Archaeology) | Raise no objections, subject to condition.  |
| 5.10 | Woking Borough Council                          | No response received.   |
| 5.11 | Guildford Borough Council                       | No response received.   |
| 5.12 | Surrey Police (Crime<br>Prevention)             | No objection to the proposal. Enhanced security measures have been suggested.   |
| 5.13 | SHBC Leisure Department                         | No comments.  |
| 5.14 | SHBC Environmental<br>Health Officer            | No objection, subject to conditions.  |

## 6.0 REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 Consultation with local residents, consultees and other third parties was carried out extensively during the course of the application over the period of several months since April 2014 until the determination date. Individual letters were sent to 184 households, 16



statutory and non-statutory consultees, 6 site notices were displayed adjacent to the application site at different times, public notices in the local press were published and the Secretary of State was advised.

6.2 At the time of preparation of this report 141 letters of objection, 2 letters of general support and 1 petition against the proposal have been received. The main issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- Consultation period inadequate [see para 6.1];
- Green Belt should be reinstated [see para 7.3.8, 7.3.9 & 7.5.3];
- Design of the proposed houses does not match any dwellings in a wider area [see para 7.4.7];
- Proposal does not include provision of smaller homes, such as bungalows for elderly population [see para 7.6.5];
- Loss of amenities to existing neighbours of the site due to the proposed layout of new dwellings and the block of flats [see section 7.7];
- Loss of trees on east boundary resulting in overlooking [see para 7.7.13 – 7.7.17];
- Safety hazard in terms of the increased traffic (Snowdrop Way area) [see para 7.8.3 – 7.8.4];
- Access via Snowdrop Way is inadequate – the existing access from Queens Road should be used instead [see para 7.8.3 - 7.8.5];
- Access to 2 new dwellings from Chatton Row is inadequate (building works relating to these dwellings should be carried out from the application site to avoid traffic implications in Chatton Row) [see para 7.8.6];
- Submitted Documents commissioned by the applicant are not credible [see para 7.8.7];
- Disturbance during demolition and construction [see para 7.8.10].
- Parking provision on site [see para 7.8.11];
- Disturbance to wildlife and trees [see section 7.10];
- Inadequate boundary treatment at border with Bisley Common [see section 7.11];
- Conifers to northern boundary should be replaced (maintenance issues) [see para 7.11.7];
- Pressure on local infrastructure (GPs, schools, transport) [see para 7.13.3];
- Drainage/electricity supply issues [see para 7.14.2];
- Pollution (car fumes, light, noise) [see para 7.14.5];
- Adverse social impact on Snowdrop Way community & increase in anti-social behaviour [see para 7.14.6];
- Duty to protect and promote play opportunities for children and young people under article 31 of the UN Convention of the Rights of the Child

*[Officers comment: In this respect the planning system including the NPPF automatically takes into account human rights. The Committee is reminded of the European Convention on Human Rights including Article 8, the right to respect private and family life and the home and Article 1 of the First Protocol the right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions. There is considered to be no interference with*

*these rights].*

## **7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATION**

7.1 The National Planning Policy Framework; Policies CP1, CP2, CP3, CP5, CP6, CP8, CP11, CP12, CP14, DM9, DM10, DM11, DM16 and DM17 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012; and, Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan are material considerations in this case. In addition, the following documents and legislation are also relevant: the Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (2011); the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (2012); Interim procedural Guidance for Core Strategy & Development Management Policies DPD (Affordable Housing Policies CP5 & CP6); Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England) Regulations 2011; and, the Localism Act 2011.

7.2 It is considered that the main issues to be addressed in determining of this application are:

- Principles of residential development including loss of employment use, provision of residential development and appropriateness in the Green Belt;
- Impact on the character of the area;
- Impact on the Green Belt;
- Housing mix and affordable housing;
- Impact on residential amenities;
- Whether the development is acceptable in terms of parking & highway safety;
- Impact on Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area;
- Impact on biodiversity and consideration of EIA;
- Trees, landscaping, open space and recreation including the Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP);
- Drainage and risk of flooding;
- Impact on Infrastructure; and
- Other matters including sustainable design and construction, archaeology, land contamination & pollution; and designing out crime.

### **7.3 Principles of residential development including loss of employment use, provision of residential development and appropriateness in the Green Belt**

#### Loss of Employment Use

7.3.1 The application site is currently in employment use as 'Bisley Office Furniture' factory in B1/B2/B8 Class Uses. The site has been in industrial/manufacturing use since 1941. The facility is being relocated to Wales into a more modern functional industrial accommodation and the site has being vacated since summer 2013. Only a few office employees remain on site to date and the property is surplus to requirements.

7.3.2 The 'Employment Land Review for Surrey Heath, Hart & Rushmoor' (November 2009) document identifies the application site as comprising general industrial and distribution uses, fully developed with no potential for further expansion. Access to the strategic road network is poor. The site adjoins residential properties to the north, east and west, which could potentially limit some uses. The site is isolated from other business uses. Overall, the site was considered a lower quality employment site and was ranked as 19<sup>th</sup> from 20

employment sites in Surrey Heath.

- 7.3.3 The applicant submitted a statement of 'Prospects For Continuing Industrial Use', prepared by Lambert Smith Hampton. The statement agrees with the findings of the above document and adds further restriction for a potential use in terms of hours of operation imposed by the 1989 Section 52 agreement between the SHBC and FC Brown (application SU/88/0609) and poor circulation around the site. In conclusion, there are no realistic prospects of achieving a sale of the site for continuing industrial/warehouse use and as a result an alternative use was recommended.
- 7.3.4 Paragraph 22 of the NPPF 2012 seeks that long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use should be avoided and applications for alternative uses of land of buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities.
- 7.3.5 The application site is not designated as a Core Employment Area, as shown on the Proposal's Map of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012. Policy CP8 (Employment) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 promotes economic growth and states that loss of employment land on sites outside of Core Employment Areas will only be permitted where wider benefits to the community can be shown.
- 7.3.6 Based on the evidence provided by the applicant and findings of the Employment Land Review for Surrey Heath, Hart & Rushmoor (2009) document, there is no realistic prospect of the site being used for industrial/warehouse use. Following advice in the NPPF and the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012, an alternative use of the site, such as residential, is considered acceptable.

#### Provision of residential development

- 7.3.7 The majority of the application site falls within the settlement area where housing is generally acceptable, subject to other material planning considerations. In the light of the above comments in connection with the potential retention of the employment use, the Council considers that the residential redevelopment is appropriate within the site.

#### Appropriateness in the Green Belt

- 7.3.8 The NPPF advises that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belt and that the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics of the Green Belts are their openness and their permanence (para 79.). When considering any planning application, substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.
- 7.3.9 In principle, redevelopment of this site is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This is because para 89 lists a number of exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt in terms of erection of new buildings. These include complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development. Para 80 of the NPPF lists five purposes of the Green Belt. These include: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. A full impact assessment of the proposed development on the openness of the Green Belt and of its purposes, please see section 7.5 below.

### **7.4 Impact on the character of the area**

7.4.1 The NPPF seeks a presumption in favour of sustainable development and to secure high quality design, as well as taking account of the character of different areas. It also states that the planning policies and decisions should aim that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping (para 58). Para. 59 advises that the local planning authorities should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally. Policy CP1 (Spatial Strategy) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 states that new development will be directed in accordance with the spatial strategy which provides the most sustainable approach to accommodating growth making the best use of infrastructure and services whilst respecting the character of the Borough. Policy DM9 (Design Principles) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 continues to promote high quality design that respects and enhances the local environment.

Appraisal of the application site and of surrounding areas

7.4.2 Before assessing the impact of the proposal on the character of the area (including its layout, access, scale, massing and height) it is necessary to understand the existing site context. The following paragraphs will appraise the character of the area.

7.4.3 The applicant states the existing building (approximate gross internal area of 20,000sqm) comprises an amalgamation of interconnecting structures mostly of steel, brick and asbestos. The height of the property varies and stands a maximum of 9.35m high. Part of the building to the southwest of the site is of two storeys brick built with steel roof. Substantial expanse of hardstanding to the south and west of the building is used for parking.

7.4.4 The application site is located to the south end of the village, on the border of the settlement and the rural area. The ground levels of the site, as confirmed by the applicant, vary slightly at approximately +50 AOD (above ordnance datum) with the land being lower to the south at Bisley Common. The surrounding area is gently undulating, between +40m and +55m AOD. The topography contributes to the landscape character of the area. Soft landscaping on the application site is limited to the boundary trees and hedges that provide screening of the factory building from the neighbouring properties.

7.4.5 The site is bounded by curtilages of residential properties to the east, north and west; and by Bisley Common to the south. The surroundings of the site contain three distinctive residential character areas: the Guildford Road environs to the east; the Queens Road/Snowdrop Way environs to the north and west; and, the Chatton Row environs, also to the west.

7.4.6 Properties within Guildford Road environs are detached dwellings, single or two-storey in height; that are situated on larger, predominantly longer than wider plots. The majority of the properties to the Queens Road/Snowdrop Way environs are semi-detached or linked detached residential properties of two-storeys in height. The Chatton Row environs comprise of detached, single or two-storey dwellings of various design styles, set within large plots. Chatton Row incorporates substantial amount of vegetation to its both sides and has a verdant, low density built form feel. There is not an established front building line and the existing built form is informed by the landscape features.

7.4.7 It is considered that the redevelopment of the existing industrial site for a residential use that is bounded by residential properties to the majority of its boundary would improve and enhance the overall appearance of the area. The surrounding three character areas, as identified above, include a substantial variety of types of dwellings in terms of their appearance and form. In connection with the raised objection to the proposed design, based on the above assessment, the officers do not consider that in respect of materials and architectural design the proposed buildings would be harmful to the local area in terms of their appearance.

7.4.8 The proposed development would include not only individual dwellings, but also would

introduce a block of flats. This form of residential development is not unusual in the village and an example of this could be the two blocks of flats to the east side of Guildford Road at No. 331. As the proposed block of flats would be contained within the envelope of the site, and as this form of residential development is not an alien form in the area, the implementation of a block of flats within the application site is not considered inappropriate in principle.

#### Proposed layout and access

- 7.4.9 The applicant submits that the proposed site layout incorporates a movement hierarchy that combines the function of the street as a movement corridor alongside its place function, resulting in a high level of legibility of the development. Streets are defined by the proposed building layout. The internal roads structure represented by a principal vehicular route with several secondary cul-de-sacs is simple to navigate. A pedestrian route along the principal vehicular route is connected to the existing pedestrian route in Snowdrop Way. Officers consider that the proposed street patterns would be easy to navigate through.
- 7.4.10 The access to the development is created by a row of three detached dwellings to each side with a landmark building at the focal point. All road bends within the development would be occupied by a focal building/dwelling, which would provide a point of interest for the viewer. The proposed affordable housing courts however would not benefit from such a view on entrance. Although those focal points would not be represented by a building, there would be a green hedge screening to all courts on the boundary of the site with the already established neighbouring residential dwellings. It is considered this would aid legibility of the development.
- 7.4.11 The applicant confirms that the application site is currently accessed via a right of way over third party land directly from Queens Road. The proposed access is to be provided from Snowdrop Way, which is a residential cul-de-sac with a turning head to its east end and footways on either side. The proposal includes two dwellings that would be accessed via Chatton Row, which is a single lane with no footways. At the junction of Snowdrop Way with Queens Road, there are dropped kerbs enabling pedestrians to access the footway on the northern side of this road. Formalising of this crossing is part of the development proposals. Highway impacts assessment is outlined in section 7.8 below.
- 7.4.12 Natural play area and an open space would be provided on site to meet the recreational needs of the existing community in the locality and of the future community created by the development. It would be located to the southwest corner of the site, adjacent to Bisley Common, enabling the residents to make most of the already existing informal recreational area at Bisley Common. The natural play area would be easily accessible and within a maximum of 400m walking distance from any dwelling on the application site. In addition, all dwellings, apart from the flats, have rear garden amenity areas, which are in principle considered sufficient to the scale of the proposed dwellings.
- 7.4.13 There is a distinctive difference between the north/settlement and the south/Green Belt parts of the site. The settlement part is more urban in character that would comprise of a higher density development with larger quantum of development when compared with the more open, Green Belt part. The north side involves smaller dwellings, flats and includes all the proposed affordable housing. The southern part accommodates larger dwellings set on larger plots reflecting spaciousness with allowance for further landscaping, when compared with the north part. This contrast is considered acceptable in principle due to the environmental constraints of the whole, in excess of 4ha size application site.

#### Proposed scale, massing and height

- 7.4.14 The existing factory building accommodates a footprint of approximately 17,800m<sup>2</sup> and a volume of approximately 121,930m<sup>3</sup>. This is a substantial scale compared with the neighbouring residential dwellings and is the reflection of its current industrial use. The existing building represents a large mass of built form that is not comparable with any other existing built form in the surrounding area. The redevelopment of the application

site is therefore an opportunity to create a development that would reflect the character of the surrounding area in terms of its scale and massing. The proposed development would substantially reduce the level of the hardstanding, footprint and volume within the site by approximately 46%, 52% and 53% respectively, which would effectively improve the overall appearance of the site in the context of the village.

- 7.4.15 In terms of its height, the existing factory stands at a maximum of 9.35m. The proposed height of dwellings would vary from a minimum of 7.9m (Marlow house type) to a maximum reaching 9.45m (Sandringham house type). The maximum height of the proposed block of flats (Snowdon) would be 11.7m. The proposed development would spread throughout the site, apart from the southwest corner of the site, while the existing building does not reach as far as the southern or western boundaries, where a large expanse of hardstanding/parking areas are currently laid out. Whilst the additional height is proposed throughout the site, the proposed height variation is not unusual within the residential areas elsewhere in the village. The proposed block of flats would be located centrally within the northern part of the site, bound by other proposed dwellings to its north, west and south. Whilst it would be of a maximum height of 11.7m, its visual impact would be contained within the envelope of the application site and therefore not considered harmful to the character features of the wider surrounding area.

#### Proposed density

- 7.4.16 The NPPF advises that to boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should set out their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances. Although density is not considered a reliable indicator as to whether a scheme is acceptable in terms of the proposed built form, it helps to inform the appropriateness of the development in comparison with the other indicators outlined above, including access, layout, scale, massing and height, and as stated in para. 59 of the NPPF.
- 7.4.17 Indicative densities in the surrounding area of the application site reflect the three distinctive character areas as outlined above. The overall density of the built form within the Guildford Road environs is approximately 15 dph. The Queens Road/Snowdrop Way environs have the approximate density of 26 dph; and the Chatton Row environs a much lower density of approximately 7 dph.
- 7.4.18 The average density of the proposed development would be 27.5 dph. There would be two character areas within the application site itself, balancing the environmental constraints of the site. Medium density areas (approximately 38.7 dph) would be located within the core area of the development, reflecting the existing residential context of the village. Towards the southern portion of the application site, situated within the Green Belt designation and adjacent to rural Bisley Common, density reduces to approximately 14 dph in order to incorporate a more appropriate, landscape dominated character. The site, due to its size in excess of 4ha, would in effect create its own, two distinctive character areas, which would be in terms of density similar to the neighbouring; albeit not identical. In the light of the above considerations in terms of layout, access, scale, massing and height, the proposed density as an additional indicator, would be considered in keeping with the character of the wider surrounding area. In conclusion, the proposed development is not considered to result in any detrimental impact within the surrounding area in terms of the amount of the built form reflected in the proposed layout, access, scale, massing height and density.
- 7.4.19 In conclusion, based on the above considerations, the proposed layout, access, scale, massing, height and density are considered to respect and integrate into the established character of the area. In addition, in terms of the proposed scale, massing and overall design, the proposed development is considered to enhance the local character.

### **7.5 Impact on the Green Belt**

- 7.5.1 The south, southeast and southwest part of the site lies within the designation of the Metropolitan Green Belt. This part of the site is occupied by a permanent structure of the

factory building with the associated fixed surface structures in the form of a hardstanding and therefore, in line with the NPPF, it is considered to fall within the definition of 'previously developed land' (PDL). The southern part of the existing factory building is fairly substantial and covers approximately 3,880m<sup>2</sup>; with the surrounding hardstanding expanding to approximately 15,300m<sup>2</sup>. Its approximate volume is 29,169m<sup>3</sup> and the approximate floor area 7,760m<sup>2</sup>.

- 7.5.2 The existing built form resulting in the greatest impact on the openness of the Green Belt is the factory building, standing at a maximum of 9.35m high. The impact on the openness in connection with the hardstanding that carries no height dimension is considered negligible.
- 7.5.3 The proposal includes 26 detached dwellings, detached garages (6 double and 1 single) with additional hardstanding areas (access roads and rear patios) within the Green Belt designation. These buildings would cumulatively create approximate volume of 21,165m<sup>3</sup> and approximate floor area of 6,350m<sup>2</sup>, which represents the overall reduction when compared with the existing by approximately 27% and 18% respectively (see table below).

| <b>Green Belt part of the site</b> | Floor Area (m <sup>2</sup> ) | Volume (m <sup>3</sup> ) |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Existing                           | 7,760                        | 29,169                   |
| Proposed                           | 6,350                        | 21,165                   |
| <b>Difference</b>                  | <b>- 18%</b>                 | <b>- 27%</b>             |

As such, the proposed mass represented by volume and floor area would reduce the extent of the existing factory building and therefore it is not considered that the proposed replacement buildings would be materially larger than that they replace. It is considered that the introduction of the proposed operational development that represents substantial reduction in volume and floor area when compared with the existing built form would benefit the openness of the Green Belt in general.

- 7.5.4 The application site is a previously developed, brownfield land. The proposed development would not encroach on open, undeveloped Green Belt land. The proposal is considered to assist in urban regeneration by recycling of urban land in terms of para. 80 of the NPPF.
- 7.5.5 Whilst the current redevelopment scheme it is not considered to result in any adverse harm to the openness of the Green Belt by definition or in any other harm that would justify refusal of the scheme on these grounds, any future developments to this part of the site might lead to the deterioration of the openness of the Green Belt and as such, control of any such development would be secured by condition.
- 7.5.6 In conclusion, the proposed development would reduce the impact of the existing factory building on the openness of the Green Belt and is not considered to conflict with the purpose of including land within the Green Belt. The proposal is therefore not inappropriate development and no objection is raised on these grounds.

## **7.6 Housing mix and affordable housing**

- 7.6.1 The Core Strategy 2012 contains policies, namely CP5 (Affordable Housing) and CP6 (Dwelling Size and Type) that require a particular housing mix and type on larger development sites. Policy CP5 seeks a target of 35% of all net additional housing as affordable, split evenly between social rented and intermediate. This is to be achieved by affordable housing being provided on all schemes proposing 3 and more net additional

units in the form of a financial or on site provision. The proposed development, as it is for more than 15 units (net), is required to provide 40% on site affordable housing provision. Policy CP6 will encourage market housing and unless evidence of housing need or viability suggests otherwise, generally expects intermediate affordable and social rented units to be provided in accordance with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) or other subsequent assessments.

7.6.2 The current SHMA, the 'North West Surrey and North East Hampshire, Strategic Housing Market Assessment, Final Report 2009' identifies the projected net shortfall of dwellings in relation to their size, which is reflected in Policy CP6 in percentage values. Policy CP6 indicates that the market housing should be of the following mix:

- 10% of 1 bed units;
- 40% of 2 bed units;
- 40% of 3 bed units; and
- 10% of 4 bed units.

The proposed development would provide 68 market units within the following approximate size ratios:

- 15% of 2 bed units (10);
- 13% of 3 bed units (9);
- 53% of 4 bed units (36); and
- 19% of 5 bed units (13).

7.6.3 As outlined in the above paragraph, the proposed development would not provide the ratio of the market units as required by Policy CP6. During the pre-application stage, the officers negotiated a number of 2 bed units to be included within the scheme as at that time, no such units were to be provided. The application currently includes ten 2 bed market units. Whilst the proposed market housing mix is not in accordance with the policy, having regard to the requirement for housing development, officers consider that this requirement warrants a departure from this housing policy and is therefore acceptable.

7.6.4 The proposal would provide 45 affordable units. This represents 40% of the proposed units, which is in line with the requirement of Policy CP5 and therefore considered acceptable. The affordable housing mix, although not exactly following the requirement of Policy CP6, has been reviewed by the Housing Manager of the SHBC and is considered satisfactory. The intermediate and social rented ratio of the affordable residential units has been suggested by the SHBC during the course of the application and shall be secured by way of a legal agreement. The applicant expressed willingness to complete a legal agreement to secure this provision. However, if a satisfactory legal agreement is not received by 26<sup>th</sup> November 2014, this must be added as a reason for refusal due to the failure to deliver a development, which would meet the housing requirement of all sectors of the community.

7.6.5 A representation that the proposal does not include provision of smaller homes, such as bungalows for elderly population was received. However, the development includes a number of single and double bedroom units on site in the form of flats and small two-storey dwellings.

## **7.7 Impact on residential amenities**

7.7.1 The NPPF seeks a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Policy DM9 (Design Principles) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 ensures that the amenities of the occupiers of



the neighbouring properties and uses are respected.

- 7.7.2 It is considered that the neighbours adjacent to the boundaries of the application site would be most affected by the proposed development and therefore the impact on these residents would be assessed at a greater length in the following paragraphs.

Impact on dwellings to the west (including odd No's. 1 – 27 & 42 Snowdrop Way)

- 7.7.3 Impact of Plots 101 (Cambridge) and 1 (Leamington): These two Plots would be located to the northeast, adjacent to No's. 3 & 5 Snowdrop Way. Both Plots have first floor side non-habitable room windows, which could be obscurely glazed. No's. 3 & 5 Snowdrop Way have their side elevations facing the application site. Due to their internal layout, separation distances to the existing neighbours and their orientation to the northeast, it is not considered that the proposed Plots 101 and 1 would result in any adverse overlooking, loss of privacy or light.
- 7.7.4 Separation distances of approximately 16m from Plot 2 (Cambridge); 12m from Plots 3 (Worcester) & 4 (Oxford); 10m at its minimum from Plot 11 (Marlow) and the average 12.5m from Plot 12 (Worcester) to the west boundary of the application site with the neighbouring dwellings No's. 5, 17, 27 and 42 Snowdrop Way ensures that no adverse loss of amenities would result.
- 7.7.5 Plots 5 and 8 (both Shrewsbury) located parallel to No's 27 and 42 Snowdrop Way in the area of the proposed site access have no first floor side windows. Their relationship would be similar to that of with their existing neighbours, No's 25 and 40 respectively. However No. 42 has a first floor side bedroom window facing the application site. The rear wall of the proposed dwelling on Plot 8 would be approximately in line with that bedroom window. Due to its orientation to the east with a separation of 2.5m, the proposed Plot 8 is not considered to adversely affect the amenities of the occupiers of No. 42. Due to the forward projection of Plot 5 and the separation of 9m to the main dwelling of No. 27, no detrimental effect on amenities of the occupiers of No. 27 is considered to result.

Impact on dwellings to the north (including even No's. 28 – 42 Snowdrop Way)

- 7.7.6 The strip of land to the north of Plots 26 and 27 (both Dart) located adjacent to the rear boundaries of No's. 30-42 Snowdrop Way would be managed by a management company and is proposed to be created by a hedge. Due to the separation distances between the proposed and the existing dwellings, their orientation and a minimum 5.5m wide strip of land in between, the proposed development is not considered to result in any adverse loss of amenities to the above existing neighbours.
- 7.7.7 Rear elevations of Plots 38 & 39 (both Tweed) would be located a minimum of 12.5m from their north boundaries with No. 28 Snowdrop Way. Due to the separation distances, no adverse effect on residential amenities of the above neighbour would occur.

Impact on dwellings to the north & west (including dwellings in Chatton Row)

- 7.7.8 Plots 40 (Sandringham) and 47 (Balmoral) would be located to the south of No. 11 Chatton Row with approximately 3.2m wide strip of land between the boundaries of the application site and of No. 11. No. 11 is a single storey dwelling with a deep garden amenity space. Plot 47 would be set directly to the south of the bungalow, maintaining a separation distance of 9m between the side walls. Although Plot 47 is a two-storey dwelling and would be located next to a bungalow, such a relationship could be found elsewhere in Chatton Row at present. Due to the substantial separation distance, Plot 47 is not considered to result in overbearing impact on No. 11.
- 7.7.9 Layout of both Plots would be parallel with No. 11. Plot 47 has no first floor side windows and therefore no adverse overlooking would result. Plot 40 would have a first floor bathroom window within the north elevation, facing the rear amenity area of No. 11. This could be obscurely glazed to prevent any overlooking and loss of privacy and secured by condition.

- 7.7.10 Relationship between Plots 47, 45 (Marlborough) and 46 (Blenheim) with No's. 10, 12 and 14 Chatton Row would be front-to-front or front-to-side with the separation distances between 23 - 43m. These are considered ample in terms of the potential impact of the proposed dwellings on residential amenities of the above existing dwellings.

Impact on dwellings to the east & south (including dwellings No's. 300 – 340 Guildford Road)

- 7.7.11 No. 340 Guildford Road would share its rear and side boundaries with Plots 56 (Sandringham), 60 (Richmond), 61 (Marlborough), 62 (Richmond) and 63 (Marlborough). All the proposed Plots would be set sufficiently back from these boundaries, as not to result in any adverse loss of amenities. Plot 56, however, would have a first floor side facing bathroom window, which could be obscurely glazed to prevent any overlooking and loss of privacy to No. 340 and secured by condition.
- 7.7.12 Plot 64 (Sandringham) would be adjacent to the rear boundary of No. 330 Guildford Road. A minimum separation distance of approximately 14.5m would be maintained between the side wall of Plot 64 and the rear wall of No. 330. Plot 64 would be built along approximately 12m of the 48m long rear boundary of No. 330. It is not considered that Plot 64 would result in any adverse loss of amenities, subject to the first floor side bathroom window being obscurely glazed.
- 7.7.13 Plots 65 – 70 (Cambridge x2, Harrogate x2 and Leamington) would maintain separation distances to the east boundary of the application site in excess of 10.5m. The existing and the approved (ref. SU/13/0416) dwellings to Guildford Road, which would abut the proposed Plots, would be a minimum of 9.9m set back from the boundary and therefore it is not considered that any adverse loss of residential amenities would occur.
- 7.7.14 Plots 74 – 77 (all Dart) would face the approved scheme for two new dwellings to the rear of No. 320 Guildford Road (ref. SU/13/0416) and with the separations to the boundary between 10.2 and 13m, no adverse overlooking is considered to result. In addition, due to their orientation to the north of the approved development, no detrimental loss of light would occur.
- 7.7.15 Side walls of Plots 77 (Dart), 78 (Tavy), 90 (Dart) and 91 (Tavy) would be located to the west of the east boundary of the application site with a minimum 5m wide strip of land in between. Properties in Guildford Road, set within deep plots would be located in ample distance from the east boundary of the application site and therefore not affected by the proposal in terms of residential amenities. In addition, Dart and Tavy housing types have no side windows and therefore no loss of privacy would occur. The building comprising of 12 flats (Snowdon) would maintain a separation distance of approximately 25m to the east boundary. Although this would be a three-storey property, due to this separation, it is not considered that it would result in any adverse loss of amenities to the existing occupiers of dwellings in Guildford Road.

Impact on dwellings to the north (including odd No's. 1 - 19 Queens Road)

- 7.7.16 Plots adjacent to the north boundary of the application site No's. 91 - 99 (Tavy x4, Dart x2, Evesham x2 & Leamington) are considered to maintain sufficient separation distances in excess of 25m to the dwellings to the south side of Queens Road and are not considered to result in any detrimental loss of amenities to the existing occupiers.

Wider impacts on residential amenities

- 7.7.17 New dwellings within the application site were designed as such that no adverse overlooking or loss of privacy to the future occupiers of the development would occur. This is subject to the first floor side facing windows being obscurely glazed, which could be secured via condition. The scale of the rear amenity areas varies throughout the development with larger gardens being provided to the lower density development to the south side of the site, reflecting a more rural character.

- 7.7.18 The layout of rear amenity areas of a number of Plots (1, 16, 35, 46, 47, 54, 55, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 99 and 101) would be affected by siting of the proposed garages. The majority of these detached garages project substantially to the rear of the walls of the new dwellings and in some cases create a courtyard type of rear garden area. Although this is not ideal, it is not considered that these layout deficiencies would be to such a detriment to the amenities of the future occupiers as to warrant refusal of the scheme.
- 7.7.19 In terms of residential amenities of the wider surrounding area, the properties located further away from the application site are considered too far to be adversely affected by the proposed development. It was brought to the attention of the officers that the current proposal would have an adverse impact on the community in Snowdrop Way, due to the proposed access. Although the proposal would result in substantially larger amount of traffic through the existing cul-de-sac, the SCC Highway Authority raised no objections in terms of highway safety, as the existing road system is considered sufficient to accommodate the proposed residential development. It is also considered that the quality of the surrounding environment would improve considerably, as the existing factory building and the related traffic on the application site and in the locality would be removed. The proposal would create a new neighbourhood community that would have the potential to provide safe and attractive environment also for the existing community in Snowdrop Way. In addition, the natural play area and the Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) would be provided not only for the future occupiers of the proposed development but also for the existing families in the locality.
- 7.7.20 In conclusion, the proposed development is not considered to result in any detrimental loss of residential amenities to the existing residents or the future occupiers of the development.

## **7.8 Whether the development is acceptable in terms of parking and highway safety**

- 7.8.1 Para. 32 of the NPPF indicates that plans and decisions should take account of whether: the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site; safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. Policy CP11 (Movement) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 supports proposals to improve public transport in the Borough. New development that will generate a high number of trips will be directed toward previously developed land in sustainable locations or will be required to demonstrate that it can be made sustainable to reduce the need to travel and promote travel by sustainable modes of transport. All new development should be appropriately located in relation to public transport and the highway network and comply with the Council's car parking standards. Policy DM11 (Traffic Management and Highway Safety) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 seeks all development to ensure that no adverse impact on the safe and efficient flow of traffic movement on the highway network results.
- 7.8.2 Following the submission of the Surrey County Council Highway Authority (CHA) initial consultation response in connection with the highway related matters Bisley residents requested a meeting with the Authority to further clarify these issues and justify their conclusions. This meeting was arranged and the residents met the representatives of CHA. Following their discussions, the CHA produced an amended consultation response and provided further comments from Surrey Fire Services.

### Proposed access

- 7.8.3 Although the existing factory site has an access off Queens Road, the majority of the proposed development (111 residential units) would use a single access from Snowdrop Way. Snowdrop Way is a residential cul-de-sac currently serving 30 dwellings and as such all traffic generated by the proposal would be a new traffic. As a result, the existing cul-de-sac would serve 141 dwellings. The CHA comments that the Surrey Design Guide

Technical Appendix notes that *'a residential cul-de-sac measuring 5.5m wide is an appropriate width to serve up to 300 dwellings and acceptable for a road with on street parking. It is also adequate to allow two HGV's to pass one another.'*

- 7.8.4 The Surrey Fire Services, having been consulted on the proposal by the CHA raised no objection in terms of impediment on the emergency vehicles access via Snowdrop Way or the fact that the proposed development would be accessed via only one access route. Although the CHA considers that a secondary point of access would be advantageous, no objection to a single access was raised, as such an objection would not be justified. Therefore the CHA concludes that *'for all these reasons and whilst the residents' concerns are recognised, the Highway Authority are unable to raise any objection due to the impact of additional traffic movements in Snowdrop Way.'*
- 7.8.5 In the Statement of Community Involvement, the applicant states that in response to the particular concerns raised about the access, further meetings with the CHA to explore alternative options were sought. As stated in conclusions of the above document: *'In response to the clearly stated preference of Showdrop Way residents for using the existing access off Queens Road, Redrow Homes requested further meetings with the relevant highways authority, Surrey County Council. At these, it was made clear that the County Council viewed this as the most viable access for the site; Redrow Homes considers that it has done all that can be considered reasonably possible in this account to explore alternative options for access.'*
- 7.8.6 Two of the proposed dwellings would be accessed via Chatton Row. In the acknowledgement that this road is a narrow lane, the proposal incorporates a new turning head for all road users, which is considered by the CHA to provide *'sufficient mitigation for the very low level of additional traffic that will be introduced to Chatton Row.'* A suggestion from the residents of Chatton Row was made that due to the narrow nature of the lane, the construction traffic should be navigated through the application site only. This could be secured by condition.

#### Traffic generation and impact

- 7.8.7 The CHA is satisfied with the conclusions of the Transport Assessment and that it provides *'a reliable estimation of the likely impact of the development.'* Matter raised by the residents in terms of the submitted documents, particularly the Transport Statement, commissioned by Redrow being not credible has not been supported by any evidence showing contrary. As such, the submitted details are considered adequate for the purposes of determination of this application.
- 7.8.8 A comparison of the likely traffic generation between the existing commercial and the proposed residential use was made. The existing use, if fully operational, would typically generate 128 vehicles in the morning peak hour and 120 in the evening. The estimated traffic generation of the proposed residential use is 53 in the morning and 61 vehicles in the evening peak hour, which would result in overall reduction in the amount of traffic by 75 and 58 vehicles respectively.
- 7.8.9 As outlined in the Transport Assessment, the Guildford Road/Queens Road junction currently operates close to its limit of operation efficiency; and by 2019 it would operate beyond its operational capacity, due to the normal background traffic growth. However, as outlined above, the proposed development would result in reduction of traffic when compared with the fully operational existing use and therefore would not impact on the existing/predicted operational efficiency of the above junction. The applicant states that *'with regard to the junction of Snowdrop Way with Queens Road, the Transport Assessment confirms that the increased flows can be accommodated.'*
- 7.8.10 While concerns of the local residents in terms of the disruption and traffic implications that may be caused by the construction works are noted, it is not the planning system's role to obstruct development on this basis. Inevitably, any construction works may lead to some temporary disruption. Ordinarily, the requirements of Environmental Health legislation will seek to limit any harm so far as reasonably practicable. An informative

could be added to the decision notice to draw this matter to the attention of the applicant. However, a suggestion for building works relating to the dwellings with access from Chatton Row being carried out from the application site to avoid traffic implications in Chatton Row were put forward. This could be arranged via a Method of Construction Statement condition, including submission of the proposed phasing of the development.

#### Parking provision

- 7.8.11 'Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance' published by the Surrey County Council in January 2012 informs the level of parking requirements for various developments within the County. All parking levels in terms of residential use relate to the size of dwellings and their location and are recommended as a maximum unless otherwise stated. The application site lies within the suburban edge/village/rural location, as identified by the Guidance. The required parking provision is as follows:

*'1 & 2 bed flats – 1 space per unit;*

*1 & 2 bed houses – 1.5 + spaces per unit (note 1);*

*3 bed houses – 2+ spaces per unit (note 1); and*

*4+ bed houses – 2+ spaces per unit (note 1).*

*Note 1: Where space permits, it may be appropriate to consider increased provision.'* (see Figure 1 – Recommended Guidance for Residential Parking on page 9)

In terms of the above figures, the parking provision on the application site at average allocation of 2.5 spaces per dwelling exceeds the maximum required by the Guidance. As such, it is not considered that the parking provision on site would be inadequate.

#### Emergency services

- 7.8.12 Emergency services were consulted on a request of CHA. In their response, the Surrey Fire Service advised of minimum dimensions requirements to enable the emergency vehicles to access and manoeuvre within the application site. In their conclusion it was confirmed that there was no concern on this aspect from a Fire Service or emergency access perspective. However, following concerns raised by residents of Snowdrop Way in connection with the emergency vehicles being denied access due to irresponsible parking, the Surrey Fire Service recommends that parking enforcement is introduced.

#### Sustainable transport modes

- 7.8.13 The County Highways Authority comments that *'providing new residents with an alternative choice of travel to the car will help encourage and promote the use of sustainable transport. With this in mind, access to the following has been considered as part of the development proposals:*

- Access to existing bus services on Guildford Road*
- Access to the Basingstoke Canal tow path for leisure purposes and access to Woking Town Centre*
- Access to Brookwood Rail Station for train access to London and the Southwest.*
- Access to local cycle infrastructure.*

*A number of improvements will be provided by the development to support these aims and will be provided using the Planning Infrastructure Contribution.'*

- 7.8.14 In conclusion, the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the proposed development, subject to conditions suggested by the CHA and the provision of financial contribution towards transport, would not result in any adverse traffic generation, highway safety

implications, detrimental access arrangements or inadequate parking provision in compliance with Policy DM11.

## **7.9 Impact on Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBH SPA)**

- 7.9.1 The site lies approximately 800m linear distance from the nearest part of the boundary of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (SPA). The TBH SPA Avoidance Strategy SPD outlines principles for avoidance of harm to the SPAs and identifies three avoidance measures to protect the TBHs from the impacts of new residential development. These are: a 400m buffer zone around the SPA within which no net new residential development will be permitted; the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG); and the Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) measures, a co-ordinated visitor management across the whole of the publically accessible SPA.
- 7.9.2 Para. 5.7 of the SPD indicates that major or large new developments are expected to provide bespoke on-site SANG rather than relying on the suite of SANGs being developed by the Borough Council. Developments of more than 100 dwellings will generally be expected to provide on-site SANG. Proposals for any bespoke SANG will be considered on a case-by-case basis in consultation with Natural England. In addition to SANG, contributions towards SAMM are required by Policy CP14B that states that all new residential development shall contribute toward SAMM measures. In addition, it states that the effective avoidance of any identified adverse effects must be demonstrated and secured prior to approval of the development.
- 7.9.3 The applicant has actively engaged in discussions with SCC, the owner of Bisley Common, regarding the use of this land as a SANG. At the time of submission of the current application, the applicant was confident that Bisley Common could meet the necessary requirements set out in the TBH SPA Avoidance Strategy SPD and would provide a SANG solution immediately adjacent to the site (see Planning Statement, para. 6.42). The proposed development requires a 2.2ha site as a SANG. The ongoing discussions between SCC, the developer and Natural England have so far led to the agreement that Bisley Common might be an acceptable SANG solution for the proposed development.
- 7.9.4 Bisley Common, a Site of Nature Conservation Importance and a Green Belt, is land of approximately 20ha located immediately to the south of the application site. Approximately 12ha of this land is laid to a heathland, which is currently maintained by Surrey Wildlife Trust. Further 2ha of Bisley Common is used for grazing by cattle and horses.
- 7.9.5 Part of Bisley Common, in the form of a west-east corridor, has been indicated in the Surrey Heath Local Plan 2000 and on the Proposal's Map of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 as an area to be safeguarded for a major highway proposal 'A322 (Bisley) Southern Extension'. Whilst there has been some favour in abandoning this scheme, following a recent confirmation from SCC Highway Authority, the identified area is to remain safeguarded for this purpose at present. Removal of this designation would be possible only by way of a review of the local plan.
- 7.9.6 In addition, a further discount has to be applied due to the original outline planning permission ref. SU/05/1155 (application for the erection of 14 three bedroom terraced and semi-detached dwellings and 8 two bedroom flatted units in two separate blocks and 33 car parking spaces following demolition of the existing car sale garage).
- 7.9.7 In the light of the above, all the areas of Bisley Common used as heathland, for grazing; designated for the major highway proposal; and, allocated to the already implemented scheme at No. 331 Guildford Road have to be discounted and effectively excluded from the potential SANG. Design and management plans of the proposed SANG have to take into consideration the above constraints. Some of the essential criteria to be met in terms of design of a potential SANG include:

- inclusion of a 2.3-2.5km circular walk within the SANG and links to longer footpaths outside the SANG;
- adequate and easily accessible car parking (if SANG is more than 400m from the proposed development);
- safe and appropriate footpath access from the proposed development/car park;
- a selection of safe, well maintained and easily used walking routes including unsurfaced paths;
- a naturalistic feel with a range of habitat types;
- free from unpleasant intrusions such as noise and unpleasant odours;
- gently undulating topography and focal point; and
- space for exercising dogs off-lead.

7.9.8 Natural England, having reviewed the information submitted by the applicant advises that the proposals for avoidance and mitigation measures offered are not considered to be appropriate because insufficient information has been provided on the proposed Bisley Common SANG, such there is no certainty around its viability or security in respect of available capacity, the available area and long term management. Consequently, it is Natural England's view that the planning authority will not be able to ascertain that the proposed development would not adversely affect the integrity of the SPA. In combination with other plans and projects, the development would be likely to contribute to a deterioration of the quality of the habitat on which the birds depend and increased disturbance to the bird species for which the SPA is classified, by reason of increased access to the heath including access for general recreation and dog-walking. There being alternative solutions to the proposal and there being no imperative reasons of overriding public interest to allow the proposal, despite a negative assessment, the proposal will not pass the test of Regulation 62 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.

7.9.9 The Local Planning Authority, as the competent authority, has to assess whether the proposal either during or post its implementation, would be likely to impact on the integrity of the SPA. Post development concerns are whether the proposal would facilitate a greater footfall of walkers on the SPA. The officers have undertaken a Habitats Regulations Assessment in connection with the current proposal that concludes that *'it cannot be ascertained that the project as proposed would not adversely affect the integrity of the site. As there are no imperative reasons of overriding public interest why the proposal should be carried out, the proposal does not survive the test of Regulation 49. Therefore pursuant to Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC) and Regulation 48(5) of the Conservation (Natural Habitats & c.) Regulations (1994), as amended by The Conservation (Natural Habitats &c) (Amendment) Regulations 2007, permission must not be granted.'*

7.9.10 Whilst all efforts have been made to secure Bisley Common as a SANG solution by the applicant that was also enabled by a number of extensions of time for determination of the current application by the Local Planning Authority the Council recognise that more time is required to resolve this 'in principle' matter.

7.9.11 An appeal decision at Land at Foreman Road, Ash, Surrey in December 2013 (ref. APP/Y3615/A/13/2198634) is relevant to the SANG provision in connection with a large housing development in the neighbouring Guildford Borough. The Inspector states in this appeal decision that *'I accept that there is no certainty that a suitable SANG will become available within the lifetime of a planning permission if the appeal were to succeed. However, following the Judgement in Merritt v SSETR & Mendip DC, and the subsequent advice from the Chief Planning Officers from the ODPM dated 25 November 2002 [following Merritt v SSETR & Mendip DC] it would be wrong of me to refuse to impose a Grampian, or pre-condition, solely because there is no reasonable prospect of the action*

*in question being performed within the time limit of the permission. Rather, so long as the condition would prevent any development until it was satisfied, refusal should only follow if there would be adverse planning implications from granting a permission which was not subsequently implemented.'*

- 7.9.12 The SANG solution is sufficiently advanced to ascertain that there is a reasonable prospect of achieving SANG mitigation during the lifetime of the permission. The officers sought a legal opinion, if the use of Grampian condition would be lawful, which confirmed this. As such, officers are of the opinion that imposition of such a pre-condition would not allow the permitted development to commence, unless this condition is satisfied. No harm to the SPA would arise, as no development would be allowed to commence, unless the SANG mitigation is provided. A relevant condition would be therefore imposed.
- 7.9.13 The applicant expressed willingness to complete a legal agreement to secure the required SANG contribution (£75,731). However, if a satisfactory legal agreement is not received by 26<sup>th</sup> November 2014, this must be added as a reason for refusal due to its failure to comply with the requirements of the Policy CP14B of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012; Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan; and, Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy SPD 2012 in relation to the provision of contribution towards strategic access management and monitoring (SANG) measures.

## **7.10 Impact on biodiversity and consideration of EIA**

- 7.10.1 Paragraph 109 of the NPPF requires the planning system to aim to conserve and enhance the natural and local environments by minimising impacts on biodiversity. Paragraph 118 of the NPPF also states that opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around development should be encouraged. Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 seeks to conserve and enhance biodiversity within Surrey Heath.
- 7.10.2 Surrey Wildlife Trust advised that the site has the potential for restoration or enhancement of biodiversity. Para 8.11 of the Appendix A of the Environmental Statement indicates a number of opportunities for enhancements. Subject to their implementation, it is not considered that a reduction in the ecological interest of the site is likely to arise. Inclusion of the suggested measures could be secured by a condition.
- 7.10.3 The application includes an Environmental Statement (ES), which considers the impact upon ecology. This was submitted voluntarily by the applicant. Prior to the submission of the application, the Council issued a Screening Opinion for the proposed development concluding that the proposed development was not EIA development. However, where an applicant submits an ES voluntarily, under Regulation 4, the development becomes EIA development. The ES assesses the potential impacts of the development on environment and identifies those areas where mitigation is to be required. The submitted ES concludes that subject to satisfactory drainage strategy, construction management measures and SANGs, there are no overriding environmental constraints, which would preclude the proposed development.
- 7.10.4 Further details in the form of an Addendum to the Environmental Statement featuring a Phase II Bat Survey Report has been submitted by the applicant during the course of the application. In line with the EIA Regulations, further notifications to the third parties, relevant consultees and a Secretary of State have been carried out. Surrey Wildlife Trust is satisfied that the addendum provides sufficient information for the officers to be able to assess the potential status of protected and important species (bats) on the proposed development site and the likely effect of the development on them. Requirement to undertake all the recommendations in section 5 of the addendum, particularly in reference to the applicant obtaining a European Protected Species (EPS) licence from Natural England was made as well as other recommendations in terms of suggested enhancements to the local biodiversity.
- 7.10.5 Following the additional notification in connection with the Addendum to the ES, a



number of objections from the local residents were received. These relate to the fact that trees present on the boundary of the application site are used/have potential for roosting bats and the other species, such as owls and impact of the additional light on these species. The Addendum relates to bats only and addresses both raised issues in paragraphs 5.5 and 5.6.3 respectively.

## **7.11 Trees, landscaping, open space and recreation including the Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP)**

### Trees and Landscaping

- 7.11.1 The NPPF requires appropriate landscaping resulting in visually attractive developments (para 58). Policy DM9 (Design Principles) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 states that the development would be acceptable where it achieves protection of trees and other vegetation worthy of retention and provide high quality hard and soft landscaping where appropriate, as one of the design principles.
- 7.11.2 Tree matters have been considered in the planning of this scheme. An Arboricultural Report comprises a Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment. It is BS5837:2012 compliant and includes a Tree Protection Plan for both the demolition and construction phases. There are no extant Statutory Controls in relation to the development site itself but TPO 07/99 is present to the west as Groups within the Snowdrop Ride residential development and has been noted within the Report.
- 7.11.3 There are a number of large linear groups of boundary Cypress trees on all boundaries of the site. These comprise primarily Leyland Cypress and Western Red Cedar. Originally planted to provide screening and shelter between the commercial property, adjacent residential dwellings and Bisley Common to the south. This vegetation has succeeded in the aim. However, continued retention of some areas of these trees especially to the south and west of the site, are no longer an option. Accordingly, the entire removal of Groups G2 and G3 would be advisable subject to provision of adequate replacement planting that would be sympathetic and complimentary to the landscape profile and character to the areas beyond the site boundary, particularly to the south.
- 7.11.4 Minor, unclassified and insignificant vegetation as detailed within the schedule would be removed to facilitate development. None are outstanding and the loss of these would have no significant impact on the landscape character of the area. Replacement/landscape planting will more than offset the loss. This could be secured by condition.
- 7.11.5 Landscaping includes the soft and hard landscaping. The hard landscaping includes different features, such as walls, fences and areas of hardstanding. The proposed boundary treatments include 1.8m high brick walls topped with brick coping, 1.8m close boarded fence and 1m high timber posts at 5m intervals to the south adjacent to Bisley Common and the west boundary abutting Chatton Row. Brick walls appear in a few places, where these would be harsh against the road and their appearance is not currently softened with any green planting. Plots affected are No's. 7, 10, 20, 32, 35, 51, 53, 57, 58, 73 and 82. Although not everywhere, some additional green screening could be provided in these places. The additional screening could be secured by condition. The close boarded fences are usually located between gardens and do not appear adversely obvious within the street scenes of the development. The proposed boundary treatment to the southern boundary with Bisley Common is considered acceptable, as it allows for a free access onto the Common.
- 7.11.6 Parking areas represent a further form of hard landscaping. The majority of Plots benefit from 2 off-street parking spaces in addition to a garage. These parking areas would dominate the street scenes, unless their harsh appearance is mitigated with soft landscaping. The applicant proposed minor changes to the originally submitted landscaping scheme indicating further planting provision to Garden Avenue, which was previously affected by dominance of the proposed parking areas. As such, it is

considered that the proposed planting would provide sufficient green areas to soften the otherwise harsh appearance of the proposed parking areas within this part of the development. This planting could be secured by condition.

- 7.11.7 Soft landscaping includes all planting. There is currently only a limited area consisting of several trees to the west of the existing factory building; with some existing boundary planting, which would be retained. All the other planting within the envelope of the site would be new planting. The majority of this would be situated within the rear gardens and frontages of the proposed dwellings. Satisfactory selection and implementation of appropriate species could be secured by condition.

#### Open Space and Recreation

- 7.11.8 Para 58 of the NPPF seeks that planning policies and decisions ensure that development optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses including incorporation of green and other public space as part of the development. Policy DM16 (Provision of Open Space and Recreation Facilities) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 indicates that new residential development will be expected to provide or contribute towards open space, equipped playspaces including teen facilities and outdoor sports facilities. Financial contribution towards the maintenance of facilities is required and will be secured via a legal agreement.
- 7.11.9 The proposal includes provision of a LEAP (Local Equipped Area of Play) and of a natural play area to the southwest corner of the application site, adjacent to Chatton Row and Bisley Common. Their future management, including its maintenance, would be secured via condition. In addition, the requirement for a financial contribution towards the provision of equipped playspace – MUGA [teen age group facilities – Multi Use Game Areas], an open space within urban areas and indoor sports is included in the Planning Infrastructure Contribution by way of a legal agreement. As such and subject to a legal agreement, it is considered that the proposed development complies with the requirements of Policy DM16 and of the NPPF.

#### **7.12 Drainage and Risk of Flooding**

- 7.12.1 Para 94 of the NPPF advises that local planning authorities should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking full account of flood risk, coastal change and water supply and demand considerations. Para 103 continues that local planning authorities should ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Policy DM10 (Development & Flood Risk) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 expects development to reduce the volume and rate of surface water run-off through the incorporation of appropriately designed Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) at a level appropriate to the scale and type of development.
- 7.12.2 The application site lies within Flood Zone 1, however as it is over 1 ha in size, a Flood Risk Assessment was submitted with the application. The Environment Agency (EA) reviewed the assessment's details and raised no objection with regards to groundwater quality. The soil has a relatively low permeability and therefore no surface water discharge to ground is proposed. The EA advises that the surface run-off should be provided by SuDS; an allowance for climate change is incorporated; and the residual risk of flooding is addressed.
- 7.12.3 An existing watercourse runs through the southern part of the application site. To enable the development to this part of the site, the watercourse has to be relocated to a location outside of the application site. The Council is seeking to ascertain this by imposition of a Grampian condition. Para 009 ID: 21a-009-20140306 of the Planning Practice Guidance advises that conditions requiring works on land that is not controlled by the applicant could be *'worded in a negative form (a Grampian condition) – i.e. prohibiting development authorised by the planning permission or other aspects linked to the planning permission (e.g. occupation of premises) until a specified action has been taken (such as the provision of supporting infrastructure). Such conditions should not be used*

where there are no prospects at all of the action in question being performed within the time-limit imposed by the permission.' The officers consider that the relocation of the watercourse could be secured by a Grampian condition. Additional pre-commencement conditions in terms of provision of SuDS on site could be imposed to ensure a satisfactory management of any potential flooding implications. Subject to these conditions, the SHBC drainage engineer raised no objections.

### **7.13 Impact on Infrastructure**

- 7.13.1 In October 2011 the Council formally adopted the Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document, which provides further policy context for the contributions. Contributions are required for any net additional dwellings. Level of contributions has been drawn from work carried out by the Surrey Collaboration Project and the amount payable will be dependent on the size and the location of the units.
- 7.13.2 In this instance the development requires a contribution of £771,951.38 (plus a monitoring fee at 5% of £38,597.57) which will be put towards primary education (£372,043.00), transport (£251,737.05), libraries (18,318.45), equipped playspace – MUGA [teen age group facilities – multi use game areas] (£10,498.98), open space (£25,305.90), indoor sports (£62,320.50), community facilities (£28,327.50) and waste and recycling (£3,400.00) and will ensure the infrastructure impact of the development is mitigated. The applicant expressed willingness to complete a legal agreement to secure this contribution. However, if a satisfactory legal agreement is not received by 26<sup>th</sup> November 2014, this must be added as a reason for refusal due to the adverse impact of the proposed development on the local infrastructure.
- 7.13.3 Objections were raised due to the additional pressure on local infrastructure in terms of available GPs, schools and transport. As such an additional pressure is expected, the applicant is obliged to provide a financial contribution towards the infrastructure, which includes contribution towards transport, schools and community facilities. It is the duty of the Council to provide such facilities using this financial contribution in the area of the Borough affected by the proposed development. As such, it is considered that any such pressure would be mitigated for.
- 7.13.4 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is the way local authorities raise funds towards infrastructure from developments in their area. This in the majority of cases replace the existing system of using planning obligations (Section 106 agreements) to secure funds, which is used to fund infrastructure that supports development. The Surrey Heath Borough Council's CIL Charging Schedule was adopted by Full Council on the 16th July 2014 and will come into effect on the 1st December 2014. All applications for residential use (Use Class C3) or retail/business uses (Use Classes A1 - A5) determined by the Surrey Heath Borough Council or the Planning Inspectorate/Secretary of State on 1st December 2014 or after may be CIL liable.

### **7.14 Other Matters**

- 7.14.1 Para 96 of the NPPF advise that the local planning authorities should expect new development to take account of landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping to minimise energy consumption. Policy CP2 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 requires the development to be sustainable and incorporates design. The Energy Statement document submitted with the application estimates to deliver a 25.12% reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emission. This is considered in line with the requirements of the NPPF as well as Policy CP2 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.
- 7.14.2 Objections were raised due to the pressure on utilities supplies. The energy and the other supplies to the development would be subject to agreements between the developer and the statutory undertakers. As stated in the conclusion section of the 'Utilities Report' submitted with the application, all the main services for gas, electric, water, sewage and telecoms exist within the vicinity of the proposed development.

- 7.14.3 Para 128 of the NPPF seeks that where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. Policy DM17 (Heritage) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 requires the applicants for any major development site of 0.4ha or greater, to undertake prior assessment of the possible archaeological significance of the site and the implications of their proposals, and may be required to submit, as a minimum, a desk-based assessment to accompany the application. The 'Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment' and the 'Archaeological Evaluation Report' were submitted by the applicant. Subject to conditions, the SCC Heritage (Archaeology) Officer raised no objections to the proposed development.
- 7.14.4 The applicant submitted the Geo-Environmental Assessment that provides the assessment of any geotechnical or contaminative issues associated with the existing land use. The Council's Environmental Health Officer reviewed the methodology of the submitted document and subject to conditions raised no objections to the proposal.
- 7.14.5 Objections relating to pollution were raised by the residents. It is considered that the proposed residential use of the site is unlikely to create significantly higher levels of pollution (car fumes, light and noise) than the potential levels of the existing use. As such, no objection is raised on these grounds.
- 7.14.6 Surrey Police (Crime Prevention Department) raised no objections in terms of security and crime levels, although enhanced security measures throughout the development were suggested. Therefore it is not considered that the existing crime levels would increase as a result of the proposed development.

## **8.0 ARTICLE 2(3) DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) ORDER 2012 WORKING IN A POSITIVE/PROACTIVE MANNER**

- 8.1 *In assessing this application, officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner consistent with the requirements of paragraphs 186-187 of the NPPF. This included:*

*a) Provided or made available pre application advice to seek to resolve problems before the application was submitted and to foster the delivery of sustainable development.*

The applicant has entered into pre-application discussions with the officers. Two meetings, prior to the submission of the application took place, whereby officers outlined the 'in principle' matters that had to be addressed to achieve support of the scheme, as well as the validation requirements of the future planning application.

*b) Provided feedback through the validation process including information on the website, to correct identified problems to ensure that the application was correct and could be registered.*

The agent was notified on receipt of the application of inaccuracies within the number of submitted documents. Once the required amended details were submitted, the application was validated.

*c) Have suggested/accepted/negotiated amendments to the scheme to resolve identified problems with the proposal and to seek to foster sustainable development.*

During the course of the application, the officers negotiated a number of non-material amendments to improve the proposed site layout to enable sustainable development.

*d) Have proactively communicated with the applicant through the process to advise progress, timescale or recommendation.*

Officers kept in touch with the agent during the course of the application on regular basis. This was to advise on progress of the application, particularly to monitor the development of the SANG matter, site visit arrangements, communication with the consultees and their feedback. Primarily to allow more time to resolve the SANG issue, officers suggested extension of time for the determination of the application on three occasions.

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 This report concludes that the principle of the development is acceptable. The proposal would deliver needed housing in the Borough. It would make use of the previously developed land and therefore would not be inappropriate development within the Green Belt. The loss of employment use is also justified.
- 9.2 Subject to the attached conditions, the development would not result in any adverse traffic generation, highway safety implications, detrimental access arrangements or inadequate parking provision and subject to a satisfactory legal agreement the proposed development would not result in any adverse impact on the local infrastructure. It would not result in any adverse loss of residential amenities to the existing residents or the future occupiers of the development, in any adverse impact on trees, biodiversity, drainage, flooding or character of the wider surrounding area. The proposal is also considered in line with the requirements of the national and local policies in terms of the proposed sustainable measures to be implemented within the scheme. In addition, subject to a satisfactory legal agreement, the proposal would satisfy the local plan requirements in terms of its impact on local infrastructure, affordable housing and SAMM. In conclusion, the proposed development accords with the adopted development plan and the NPPF.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

The Executive Head of Regulatory to be authorised to GRANT permission subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason: To prevent an accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions and in accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans and documents: series R.0325\_6-1, 7-1, 7-2A, 7-3, 7-4, 7-5, 7-6, 7-7A, 7-8A, 7-9, 7-10, 7-11, 7-12, 7-13, 7-14A, 7-15, 7-16, 7-17-1B, 7-17-2A, 7-17-3A, 7-17-4A, 7-17-5A, 7-17-6B, 7-17-7B, 7-17-8, 7-18, 7-19, 7-20, 7-21A and 16-2, all received on 14/04/2014; and amended plans series R.0325\_4-1J, 16-1A, 17-1A and Tree Survey, Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Protection Plan including the following plans: R.0324\_03-A, 04-A, Tree Protection Plan – Demolition Phase and Tree Protection Plan – Construction Phase, all received on 20/10/2014, unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning and as advised in ID.17a of the PPG.

3. No development shall take place until written confirmation has been obtained from the LPA that the applicant has secured a SANG in perpetuity (including its management plan); and no dwelling shall be occupied before written confirmation has been obtained from the LPA that the works required to bring the land up to acceptable SANG standard have been completed.

Reason: To comply with Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012; saved Policy NRM6 (Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area) of the South East Plan; and, the Surrey Heath Borough Council's Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (2012).

4. No development works shall commence until the applicant has secured and undertaken relocation of the watercourse from the southern end of the site onto Bisley Common; with full details of the proposed design of the watercourse, timetable for delivery and maintenance agreement submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to manage flood risk and to comply with Policy DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

5. No development shall take place until details and samples of the external materials to be used are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Materials to be agreed will include the proposed brick, tile, guttering and fenestration. Once approved, the development shall be carried out using only the agreed materials.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenities of the area and to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

6. No development shall start until a Method of Construction Statement, to include details of:

- a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
- b) loading and unloading of plant and materials
- c) storage of plant and materials
- d) programme of works (including measures for traffic management)
- e) provision of boundary hoarding behind any visibility zones
- f) phasing of the development
- g) matters relating to compliance with conditions numbered 16, 20 and 21

has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction period.

Reason: The condition above is required in order that the development should not

prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to accord with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscaping works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved, and implemented prior to first occupation. The scheme shall include indication of all hard surfaces, walls, fences, access features and the new planting, including trees to be carried out. All hard and soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. All landscaping work and new planting shall be carried out prior to the occupation of the development or in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Any plants, which within a period of five years of commencement of any works in pursuance of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced as soon as practicable with others of similar size and species, following consultation with the Local Planning Authority, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

8. A minimum of 7 working days before any development, including any works of demolition or site clearance, a pre-commencement meeting must be arranged with the Arboricultural Officer. The purpose of this meeting is to agree the extent of any facilitation or management tree works, tree and ground protection, demolition, storage of materials and the extent and frequency of Arboricultural site supervision. In all other regards the development shall proceed in accordance with the supplied **BS5837:2012 – Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction** compliant report prepared by Pegasus Planning Group Limited [Mathew Reid] and dated 17 March 2014.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

9. a) Detailed inspection of the oak tree T29, as identified on plan R.0324\_03-A received on 20/10/2014, using either Resistograph or Picus decay detection systems shall be carried out and the results submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of works.  
  
b) Should the Oak T29 be structurally compromised, as agreed by the Local Planning Authority, plant 1no of Quercus robur tree shall be planted within 2m of the tree to be removed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of the development. The tree shall have minimum stem size of 20 - 25 cm girth [nominal diameter of 7.2cm] at 1m from ground level, of a

minimum overall planted height of 4.0 – 6.0m and having a substantially straight stem and **Semi Mature** tree as specified in BS 3936. Replacement planting shall conform to the British Standard for Nursery Stock as set out in **BS 3936, Parts 1 to 5**. Handling, planting and establishment of trees shall be in accordance with **BS 8545:2014 Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape**. If any replacement planting planted in accordance to this condition die or become seriously damaged or diseased within a period of five years of the date of first occupation of the development, it shall be replaced as soon as practicable with another tree of similar size and species.

Reasons: To maintain the landscape character and profile of the area and to establish a tree which, in time, will replace the loss of amenity which was afforded by the tree, which is to be removed and to maintain the landscape character of the area to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

10. Following the completion of any Arboricultural works but before any equipment, materials or machinery are brought onto the site in connection with the development, protective fencing at least 2m high and comprising of a vertical and horizontal framework of scaffolding (well braced to resist impacts) and ground protection methods, in compliance with **BS5837:2012 – Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction**, shall be erected in accordance with the submitted and approved Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Such protection shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition nor shall any fires be started, no tipping, refuelling, disposal of solvents or cement mixing carried out and ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation or vehicular access be made, without the written consent of the borough council.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

11. A Landscaping and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter shall be carried out as approved, and implemented prior to first occupation. LEMP should detail how the site is to be planted, what ecological enhancements will be made and how public spaces and ecological features will be maintained and monitored following the occupation of the development.

Reason: To comply with Policies CP14A and DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.



12. Before any of the operations which involve the movement of materials in bulk to or from the site are commenced, wheel washing facilities shall be provided as must first be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, in order that the operator can make all reasonable efforts to keep the public highway clean and prevent the creation of a dangerous surface on the public highway. The agreed measures shall thereafter be retained and used whenever the said operations are carried out.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users to satisfy Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

13. Prior to the commencement of development a scheme to provide vehicular and pedestrian visibility splays for the new roads, accesses and driveways within the development shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for its approval. Once approved the agreed visibility splays shall be provided upon the first use of the respective road, access or driveway and thereafter shall be permanently maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users to satisfy Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

14. No development shall take place until full details of surface water drainage systems and foul water drainage system are submitted and approved in writing by the LPA. The surface water drainage system details to include attenuation of 1:100 year event at 30% climate change. Once approved the details shall be carried out prior to first occupation in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development and to accord with Policies CP2 and DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

15. Prior to the commencement of any development (for the purposes of this condition this excludes works of demolition and site clearance) details of the layout and design of the LEAP shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The details to be submitted shall include details of the facilities / equipment to be provided to deliver six play experiences together with and any fencing or buffers to be erected around the LEAP. The details to be submitted shall also make provision for the works to deliver the LEAP to be completed before occupation of the 30th residential unit and for the maintenance, in perpetuity, of the LEAP.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenities and to accord with the objectives of Policy DM16 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management

Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

16. The proposed access from Snowdrop Way or Chatton Row shall not be used for construction related vehicle access to the site. All construction traffic including that associated with the delivery of plant, materials, access by site operatives, visitor parking and staff parking and any other related traffic shall all use the existing access from Queens Road, unless agreed otherwise by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users to satisfy Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

17. Any excavations more than 0.3m in depth should be kept covered at night or provided with ramped means of escape for nocturnal foraging animals such as badgers or hedgehogs.

Reason: To comply with Policies CP14A and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

18. Before any of the proposed dwellings are occupied the proposed vehicular access to Snowdrop Way shall be designed and constructed and provided with visibility zones, in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, once constructed the access shall be permanently retained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority and the visibility zones shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction between a height of 0.6m and 2.0m.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users to satisfy Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

19. Before any of the proposed dwellings are occupied, a new section of footway shall be provided within the new access onto Snowdrop Way and shall include pram crossing points and tactile paving to join new pram crossing points and tactile paving on the opposite footways of the existing turning head in Snowdrop Way. All of which shall be constructed in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users to satisfy Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and

the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

20. No development shall be occupied until at least 20 metres of the new access road, including its junction with Snowdrop Way has been constructed in accordance with the approved plans and in compliance with conditions numbered 18 and 19 above. The proposed access to Snowdrop Way may be brought into use during construction, but shall only be used for the purposes of providing access to new residential traffic.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users to satisfy Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

21. Once the use of the existing access has ceased for the purposes of construction traffic, the existing access from the site to Queens Road shall be closed to vehicular traffic unless agreed otherwise by the Local Planning Authority. The existing concrete access shall be removed and the land encompassed by the redundant access shall be reinstated as a grass verge in a manner to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users to satisfy Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

22. Before any of the proposed dwellings are occupied, the existing junction of Snowdrop Way with Queens road shall be provided with
- (i) pram crossing points and tactile paving on either side of the existing junction radii.
  - (ii) new pram crossing points and tactile paving on both sides of Queens Road immediately to the north of its junction with Snowdrop Way.
  - (iii) new and replacement give way markings and any associated signage required.

All of which shall be constructed in accordance with a scheme to be first agreed with the Highway Authority.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users to satisfy Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

23. Before any of the proposed dwellings are occupied, the existing concrete posts located within the footway of Queens Road opposite the existing site access shall

be removed and the corresponding footway shall be reinstated, all in accordance with a scheme to be first agreed with the Highway Authority.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users to satisfy Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

24. No new development shall be occupied until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the approved plans for cars to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. The turning areas shall be retained exclusively for their designated purpose.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users to satisfy Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

25. No new development shall be occupied until space has been laid out within the site in accordance details to be submitted to and approved in writing for cycle parking to be provided, such provisions shall
- a) In the case of single dwellings, be integral to each dwelling building and be separately accessible from any garage, or
  - b) In the case of flats, be integral to each building and be secured, lit and easily accessible.

Once agreed such provisions shall be permanently retained exclusively for their designated purpose.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users to satisfy Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

26. A pedestrian/cycle access shall be provided between the site and Bridleway number 147 in accordance with details and timescales for implementation to be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The access shall be provided prior to the occupation of the 100<sup>th</sup> dwelling and shall thereafter be permanently maintained for the uninterrupted use of all users.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users to satisfy Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

27. The proposed vehicular access to plots 46 and 47 in Chatton Row including the associated new turning head shall all be designed and constructed and provided with visibility zones in accordance with the approved plans and details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once agreed the access and turning head shall be constructed in accordance with the agreed details prior to the first occupation of plots 46 and 47. The turning head shall be maintained for permanent uninterrupted use by users of Chatton Row, all to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. Any agreed visibility zones shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users to satisfy Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

28. Prior to the occupation of the development waiting restrictions shall be provided on Snowdrop Way for approximately the first 20 metres back from the junction of its junction with Queens road, subject to consultation and to the satisfaction of the Local Highway Authority.

Reason: To help improve smooth the traffic flow within Snowdrop Way and in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users to satisfy Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

29. Before first occupation of the dwellings (Plots 1 - 101) hereby approved the first floor windows serving bathrooms/en-suite shall be completed in obscure glazing and any opening shall be at high level only (greater than 1.7m above finished floor level) and retained as such at all times in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities enjoyed by future occupiers of the dwellings and to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

30. Before first occupation of the flats (Snowdon – Plots 102 - 113) hereby approved windows serving bathrooms shall be completed in obscure glazing and any opening shall be at high level only (greater than 1.7m above finished floor level) and retained as such at all times in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities enjoyed by future occupiers of the flats and to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

31. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General

Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) no development falling within Classes A, B and E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 shall be erected without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority on Plots 40 - 64.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the further development of the properties to prevent inappropriate development in the Green Belt and to accord with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

#### Informative(s)

1. The applicant is advised to contact the Council's Environmental Health department for advice in connection with handling and removal of asbestos.
2. Design standards for the layout and construction of access roads and junctions, including the provision of visibility zones, shall be in accordance with the requirements of the County Highway Authority.
3. The Highway Authority has no objection to the proposed development, subject to the attached conditions but if it is the applicant's intention to offer any of the roadworks included in the application for adoption as maintainable highways, it must be first demonstrated by the applicant that their adoption meets the County Council roads adoption policy. Any planning permission under the Town and Country Planning Act shall not be construed as the approval of the highway engineering details necessary for inclusion in an Agreement under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980.
4. Details of the highway requirements necessary for inclusion in any application seeking approval of reserved matters may be obtained from the Transport Development Planning Team of Surrey County Council.
5. Notwithstanding any permission granted under the Planning Acts, no signs, devices or other apparatus may be erected within the limits of the highway without the express approval of the Highway Authority. It is not the policy of the Highway Authority to approve the erection of signs or other devices of a non-statutory nature within the limits of the highway.
6. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out works on the highway or any works that may affect a drainage channel/culvert or water course. The applicant is advised that a licence must be obtained from the Highway Authority Local Highway Service Group before any works are carried out

on any footway, footpath, carriageway, verge or other land forming part of the highway. The applicant is also advised that Consent may be required under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991. Please see [www.surreycc.gov.uk/people-and-community/emergency-planning-and-community-safety/flooding-advice6](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/people-and-community/emergency-planning-and-community-safety/flooding-advice6). When a temporary access is approved or an access is to be closed as a condition of planning permission an agreement with, or licence issued by, the Highway Authority Local Highway Service Group will require that the redundant dropped kerb be raised and any verge or footway crossing be reinstated to conform with the existing adjoining surfaces at the developers expense. (Note: It is preferable where possible to arrange for the adjacent highway to be included in the area edged red on the application when PPG provides that conditions may be suitable to control this).

7. The developer is reminded that it is an offence to allow materials to be carried from the site and deposited on or damage the highway from uncleaned wheels or badly loaded vehicles. The Highway Authority will seek, wherever possible, to recover any expenses incurred in clearing, cleaning or repairing highway surfaces and prosecutes persistent offenders. (Highways Act 1980 Sections 131, 148, 149).
8. When access is required to be 'completed' before any other operations, the Highway Authority will normally agree that wearing course material and in some cases edge restraint may be deferred until construction of the development is virtually complete, provided all reasonable care is taken to protect public safety.
9. A standard fee may be charged for input to, and future monitoring of, any Travel Plan.
10. The applicant is advised that as part of the detailed design of the highway works required by the above condition(s), the County Highway Authority may require necessary accommodation works to street lights, road signs, road markings, highway drainage, surface covers, street trees, highway verges, highway surfaces, surface edge restraints and any other street furniture/equipment.
11. It is recommended that the use of raised rumble strips across the site that helps to define where public space ends and where private space begins and gives the residents ownership of these areas. These would be especially welcomed at the entrances to cul-de-sacs and the communal parking courts.
12. It is recommend that the individual parking spaces within the areas are given their own identity by paving them with a different material and displaying the plot number that they belong to. By designing in ownership of areas residents are much more likely to take care of them and defend them from any unwanted behaviour.
13. It is recommended that entry to the apartments via the communal door is controlled so as to deny unauthorised entry. This may be achieved with an electronic access

control system linked to each apartment. If access to the apartments is controlled at the main communal door the secure delivery of mail must be considered. This may be provided with –

- A robust external letterbox with fire retardation and anti-fishing attributes securely fixed to the external face of the building.
- A letter plate located within the wall providing ‘through the wall’ delivery via a sloping chute into a secure internal letterbox with fire retardation and anti-fishing attributes for each household.

14. Entry to the communal cycle/bin store should be controlled to give only residents legitimate access.
15. Recent research by the ‘Design against Crime’ Centre suggests that cyclists should be encouraged to lock both wheels and the crossbar to a stand rather than just the crossbar. A design of cycle stand within the storage area that enables this method of locking to be used is recommended. Minimum requirements for such equipment are:
  - Galvanised steel bar construction (minimum thickness of 3mm)
  - Minimum foundation depth of 300mm with welded anchor bar
  - Further information about secure cycle parking can be found at the following resource section of the ‘Bikeoff’ website  
[www.bikeoff.org/design\\_resource](http://www.bikeoff.org/design_resource)
16. Any external lighting scheme that is to be created should be designed in such a way that it distributes a uniformed level of light across the entire site and not light specific areas whilst throwing others into darkness. Lighting should be lit to the relevant levels as defined in BS 5489:2013. It is important that the landscape architect and lighting engineer co-ordinate their plans to avoid conflict between lighting and tree canopies.
17. Consideration for the Secured by Design Award – It is recommended the developer involved in a new project considers applying for the Secured by Design (SBD) award. The Award is a certificate given to building developments which, following consultation with local Crime Prevention Design Advisors, are built to conform to the SBD guidelines and so reduce the opportunity for crime. SBD does not guarantee that a particular development will be crime-proof but indicates that the site has been subject to a design process and improved levels of security which, in the experience of the police service and other agencies, have been shown to significantly reduce the risks and the fear of crime. Every effort will be made to assist developers achieve the award. For further information please visit the SBD website [www.securedbydesign.com](http://www.securedbydesign.com)
18. As outlined in a consultation response from Surrey Wildlife Trust, an undertaking of a further badger survey might be required immediately prior to major works



starting on site to ascertain presence of this protected species in the locality.

**In the event that a satisfactory legal agreement has not been completed by the 26<sup>th</sup> November 2014, the Executive Head of Regulatory be authorised to REFUSE for the following reasons:**

1. In the absence of a completed legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the applicant has failed to comply with Policy CP12 Infrastructure Delivery and Implementation of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 in relation to the provision of infrastructure contributions towards transport, libraries, community facilities and recycling, in accordance with the requirements of the Surrey Heath Borough Council's 'Planning Obligations and Infrastructure Provision Tariff Scheme. The proposal would therefore contribute to unacceptable additional pressure on local infrastructure to the detriment of the locality.
  2. The proposal fails to provide an adequate provision of affordable housing, and as such would not deliver a development, which would meet the housing requirement of all sectors of the community. The application is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of Policy CP5 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.
  3. In the absence of 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 in relation to the provision of contribution towards 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 2012).
-

**MINUTE LIST OF COMMITTEE**  
**17 November 2014**

| <b>APP. NO</b> | <b>WARD</b> | <b>LOCATION &amp; PROPOSAL</b>  | <b>TYPE</b> | <b>DECISION</b> |
|----------------|-------------|---|-------------|-----------------|
| 2014/0249      | BIS         | <b>17 QUEENS ROAD, (FORMERLY BISLEY OFFICE FURNITURE SITE), BISLEY, WOKING, GU24 9BJ</b>  | <u>FFU</u>  | RF              |
| ANM            |             | Erection of 113 dwellings with new access from Snowdrop Way and Chatton Row, internal roads, footways, parking, landscaping, open space with other associated works following demolition of the existing factory buildings and areas of hardstanding. (Additional information rec'd 22/09/14), (Amended plans & info rec'd 20/10/14). |             |                 |

**ACTION**

REFUSED (MEMBER OVERTURN)

REASON FOR REFUSAL TO BE CONFIRMED