

LOCATION: FORMER BRITISH OXYGEN CORPORATION, CHERTSEY ROAD, WINDLESHAM

PROPOSAL: Hybrid planning application comprising:

a) Full application for two new wings to existing building, extension to existing garage next to the clock tower and enlarged plant enclosure to existing energy centre; plus two new buildings 1 and 2 for research and development located at the southeast corner of the site together with circular test road, gatehouse, cycle/waste storage building with new vehicular access from Highams Lane; and, monorail stations and monorail track between the existing building and proposed building 1;

Outline application with all matters reserved for extension to restaurant; enlarged test road and monorail track in the western field; and, new building 3 for research and development adjacent to the M3 motorway, monorail station adjoining building 3, and test building. (Additional plans recv'd 6/3/15) (Additional plans rec'd 30/03/15) (Amended Travel Plan recv'd 25/3/15) (Additional info rec'd 08/04/15)

TYPE: Full Planning Application

APPLICANT: Kamkorp Park Limited

OFFICER: Jonathan Partington

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to conditions and referral to the Secretary of State as a Departure from the Development Plan

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 The site is the former headquarters of the British Oxygen Corporation (BOC), lies in the Green Belt and comprises approximately 22 hectares. The existing buildings are located at the northern end of the site with open fields to the south. The proposal is a hybrid planning application with full planning permission sought for extensions to the existing buildings, two new buildings on the open land at the southeast corner of the site, a new access off Highams Lane, test track and monorail. Outline permission is sought for further buildings and extensions and extended test track and monorail. The existing buildings total 12,630 m² and the proposal would total 13,864 m².
- 1.2 The applicant Kamkorp is a group of companies that specialist in research and development (R&D) with Fraser-Nash specialising in electric vehicle technologies, for example London Metrocabs. The development would supplement existing facilities at Mytchett Place but also be a bespoke cluster of high technology companies. The development would be for the fit out and testing of prototype vehicles only and would not be a general or bulk vehicle assembly manufacturing site.
- 1.3 There is no objection to the proposal on highway grounds, impacts on heritage and trees, impacts on residential amenity, noise, lighting or air quality, biodiversity, and flooding. The development is not CIL liable.

- 1.4 The extensions to the existing buildings would not be disproportionate additions but the new buildings would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt and cause significant harm to the openness of the Green Belt and its purposes. Similarly the test road and monorail would also be inappropriate and harmful Green Belt development. By association, the development would also cause harm to the existing rural, natural and undeveloped character of the area. As such it is necessary to consider whether there are any very special circumstances to outweigh the identified harm.
- 1.5 Section 8 of the report lists and details the applicant's very special circumstances. The NPPF places significant weight on the need to support economic growth. Thus, in the officer's opinion, the development's contribution to the local, regional and national economy, particularly in a growth global market, together with associated employment opportunities weighs significantly favour in support of the proposal. It is considered that the in-combination weight of the very special circumstances outweigh the harm and so this report recommends approval, subject to conditions.
- 1.6 Under the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009 this proposal represents a departure from the Development Plan, because it is major development within the Green Belt. Under this Direction and if Members agree with the recommendation to grant, the application must therefore be referred to the Secretary of State. This gives the SoS the opportunity to either make no comments or use call-in power and make the decision on the application. The Planning Authority cannot grant permission until the expiry of 21 days from the date the SoS confirms receipt of the consultation.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The site comprises approximately 22 hectares and lies within the Green Belt. The site has an established Class B1 use, with its former use as the headquarters for the British Oxygen Corporation (BOC). Since 2007 the premises have remained vacant.
- 2.2 The site is located outside of but in close proximity to the Chobham Common Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); the Thurley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham Special Area of Conservation (SAC); a National Nature Reserve; and, the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (SPA). These areas of designation are located on the northern side of Chertsey Road opposite and beyond the site. The site also lies outside the floodplain and is not identified as having a designated landscape of historical, cultural or archaeological importance.
- 2.3 All of the existing buildings (totalling approximately 12,630 sq metres) are located at the northern end of the site with the principal vehicular access off Chertsey Road used for visitors. There is also a secondary vehicular access to the site off Chertsey Lane (known as Shepherd's Lane) used for deliveries. Highams Lane runs parallel with the site's eastern boundary and at the northern end of Highams Lane there is a further vehicular access which was used by staff, with access to the main building's basement car park.
- 2.4 The main building (known as Higham Hall) has an oxygen molecular shape footprint with a series of wings fanning out. The building is part single and part two-storey, with the rear of the building having an attractive landscape setting which includes two linked ponds and a lake. Beyond this and to the site's southern boundary, which is adjacent to the M3 motorway, the land levels drop and comprise open fields. The M3 motorway itself is on higher land up on an embankment.
- 2.5 There are a series of smaller ancillary buildings located closer to Chertsey Road than the main building. This includes the locally listed clock tower, plus single storey garage and

plant building. These buildings are walled off from the main visitor entrance with a separate parking area. At the northwest corner of the site there is also a walled garden, which is a remnant of the original convent use of the site.

- 2.6 All site boundaries are well screened with mature trees and vegetation, although there are no statutory protected trees within the site or boundaries. Along the southern boundary rows of conifers have been planted to screen the motorway and the northern Chertsey Road boundary also includes walling. The immediate surrounding area is not densely populated with the most residential dwellings to the west of the site, on the edge of Windlesham.

3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1 82/0214 Demolition of existing convent buildings with exception of clock tower and associated buildings and erection of new headquarters office building, restaurant and car parking – Approved 26/7/87
- 3.2 84/0213 Details for erection of new headquarters office building, staff restaurant and car parking - Approved 26/4/84

4.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The proposal is a hybrid planning application comprising:
- a) Full/detailed application for two new wings to existing building, extension to existing garage next to the clock tower and enlarged plant enclosure to existing energy centre building; plus two new buildings 1 and 2 for research and development located at the southeast corner of the site together with circular test road, gatehouse, cycle/waste storage building with new vehicular access from Highams Lane; and, monorail stations and monorail track between the existing building and proposed building 1; and,
 - b) Outline application with all matters reserved for extension to restaurant; enlarged test road and monorail track in the western field; and, new building 3 for research and development adjacent to the M3 motorway, monorail station adjoining building 3, and test building.
- 4.2 The applicant Kamkorp is a group of companies consisting of different specialist technologies. Frazer-Nash Ltd. is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Kamkorp and is the core operating company where the research and development of electric and range-extended electric drivetrains has been carried out. Frazer-Nash provides technology to automotive original equipment manufacturers and other specialised companies and also develops its own products through the various vehicle prototypes built and tested. This includes, for example, the development and launch of electric London Metrocabs. Frazer-Nash proposes that the application site will supplement its current facilities at Mytchett Place by providing bespoke facilities for different group operations.
- 4.3 For the purposes of a) above the following table summarises the size of each proposed building (The existing fenced plant enclosure has an area of 45 sq metres and the enlarged enclosure would have a total area of approximately 87 sq m):

	Approx. maximum length (m)	Approx. maximum width (m)	Floor area GEA (m ²)	Approx. maximum Height (m)
1st wing extension to main building	23	13.5	275	5.7
2nd wing extension to main building	23	13.5	275	5.7
Garage extension	19.1	10.1	202	4.5
Building 1 (including monorail station)	91	80	6,207	7.5 - 10.5
Building 2	84	30	2,520	9.5
Gatehouse	3.5	6	20	2.6
Cycle/waste storage building	18.3	8.3	152	3.8
Monorail station adjoining main building	7.5	9	67.5	5
TOTAL (full application)	-	-	10,014 (including Building 1's canopy covering the test track)	-

- 4.4 In respect of b) above, as all matters have been reserved only indicative details of the sizes of the buildings have been provided. However, it is envisaged that the total floor area would be 3,670 sq metres (i.e. Building 3 would be approximately 108 m in length, 30 m in width with a height of 7.5 with an area of 3,380 sq metres; the monorail would have an estimated floor area of 270 sq metres; and, the remaining floorspace of 20 sq metres would be the remote test building and restaurant extension).
- 4.5 The total floor space created by all the buildings proposed under a) and b) would be 13,684 sq metres (the existing buildings have a combined floor space of 12,630 sq metres).
- 4.6 Building 1 would be sited parallel to Higham Lane and its closest elevation would be a distance of approximately 25 metres from Higham Lane. This building would accommodate

the following uses:

- Showcase buildings/museum;
- Test garage comprising a series of bays linked to testing on the test road;
- Fabrication facility for the fitting and assembly of vehicles including a rolling road, vehicle lifts and cranes;
- Centralised storage facility for incoming and outgoing goods;
- Monorail station located between the two production areas where visitors could board and link to the main building; and,
- Workshop which would be an open area for the fabrication of vehicles including cars/lorries starting from the fabrication of the vehicle chassis through to attaching wheels, electric motors, drive train and steering mechanisms.

Building 2, sited parallel to the M3, would be the prototype workshop where finishing of the design would take place, including fabrication of the bodywork. This building would also have an area for specialist testing and accommodate specialist equipment such as laser-cutters and 3D printers. Building 3 would provide a production workshop. According to the applicant Bristol Vehicles would be finished within this building but no actual production would take place, simply the final finishing of vehicles prior to onward sale.

- 4.7 Vehicular access to buildings 1 -3 would be by a new access off Highams Lane. The gate house would be located next to this access. The site currently has 209 parking spaces. This application proposes an increase of parking to a total of 261 including 13 disabled bays. This would comprise 126 spaces in the basement car park accessed from the existing Highams Lane access; 16 spaces located south of the basement access; 42 spaces in and around the courtyard area by the Clock Tower; 17 spaces perpendicular to the existing service vehicle access at Shepherds Lane; and, 60 spaces adjacent to buildings 1 and 2.
- 4.8 A hedgerow currently divides the southern fields into two parcels and the circular test road proposed as part of the detailed application, would be confined to the eastern parcel of fields and extend northwest from building 1. At its closest point it would be approximately 25 metres away from the site's eastern boundaries. The monorail track proposed as part of the detailed application would cover a distance of approximately 270 metres from the monorail station adjoining the eastern elevation of the existing building to building 1. The extended test road (including a test straight, circular dynamic testing area and incline test area) and monorail proposed under the outline submission would extend over the western parcel of fields.
- 4.9 A series of documents have been submitted in support of the application, relevant extracts of which will be referred to in sections 7 and 8 of this report. The documents, amongst others, include the following:
- Planning Statement and further Planning Statement with Green Belt Very Special Circumstances (April 2015);
 - Design and Access Statement;
 - Transport Assessment (updated March 2015);
 - Travel Plan (final March 2015);
 - Economic Statement;

- Ecological Assessment;
- Noise Assessment;
- Lighting Report;
- Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Method Statement;
- Landscape Design Statement; and,
- Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

4.10 Prior to the submission of the application the applicant undertook the following:

- Requested a Screening Opinion as to whether the proposal constituted Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) development. The Planning Authority concluded this was not EIA development;
- As reported in the SCI, undertook a public exhibition event on 16th December 2014 with an advert placed in the local press and letters sent to immediate neighbours and local stakeholders. The agents also presented the proposal to Chobham Parish Council on 21st January 2015; and,
- Pre-application meetings with the Planning Authority.

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

5.1	Surrey County Highway Authority	No objection subject to conditions.
5.2	Highways Agency	No objection or comments to make.
5.3	Natural England	No objection or conditions requested.
5.4	Surrey Wildlife Trust	Comments that the ecological survey information only considers the full application and not the outline part of the site. SWT therefore recommends that the applicant should undertake all the recommended actions in section 7 of the Ecological Assessment including the biodiversity enhancements. SWT advises that a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) ought to be considered.
		In addition to the SWT the Surrey Bat Group, Surrey Amphibian and Reptile Group, and West Surrey Badger Group were consulted. No comments have been received from any of these groups.
5.5	Environment Agency	No objection subject to conditions for surface water drainage scheme details; a remediation strategy if contamination found; and, control over infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground.
5.6	Drainage Officer	Comments are awaited.

5.7	Thames Water	Comments that there is an inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of the application and therefore requests a drainage strategy condition. In respect of surface water drainage it is recommended that the application ensures storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the public network by on or off site storage.
5.8	Tree Officer	No objection subject to conditions.
5.10	Heritage Officer	No objection or comments to make.
5.11	Surrey Gardens Trust	No objection to the extensions to the office block and the restoration of the walled garden would be welcomed. However, objects to the impact of the three new buildings, test track and monorail changing the open character of the site.
5.12	SCC Archaeologist	No objection subject to a condition securing a Written Scheme of Investigation.
5.13	Chobham Parish Council	Objects due to the impact on the Green Belt contrary to the development plan, with no very special circumstances.
5.14	Windlesham Parish Council	Objects due to the impact on the Green Belt but if there are very special circumstances for employment for local people then the Council may take a different view on this.
5.15	Economic Development Officer	<p>This type of proposal is supported by the Council's Economic Development Strategy. The Council's aspiration is to promote apprenticeships and Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths) skills in the area and to enhance the links between employers and local schools. The applicant has already developed apprenticeships links with schools, such as Collingwood, in the Borough.</p> <p>On a sub-regional level the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership's Strategic Economic Plan sets out a plan for the whole area to be 'the primary Sci:Tech Corridor in the UK...capitalising on our industrial strengths and world class research.'</p> <p>The new jobs would add a further large employer to the Borough with the resultant uplift in reputation for Surrey Heath as an 'Open for Business' Borough, home to smart growth and having a significant presence of high tech employers based locally. Research shows that each filled job in Surrey contributes around £51,000 to the UK economy in GVA (Gross Value Added), significantly higher than the national average of £39,000. There would also be indirect employment created.</p> <p>The local economy would be further boosted by additional staff living within the locality and using local amenities and retail.</p>
5.16	Environmental Health Officer	No objections in respect of air quality, noise and artificial lighting issues.

6.0 REPRESENTATION

The application was advertised in the local press and 30 individual letters of representation were sent out. At the time of preparation of this report 17 letters of objection have been received summarised below:

- 6.1 Proposal inappropriate and harmful in the Green Belt (no objections to refurbishment and extensions to existing buildings) [*Officer's comment: See paragraph 7.3 of this report*]
- 6.2 Proposal out of character with the area [*See paragraph 7.4*]
- 6.3 Monorail and new buildings would be visually intrusive [*See paragraph 7.4*]
- 6.4 Local network already at capacity. Increase of traffic from staff and visitors along the inadequate local road system including Highams Lane. Increase congestion and likelihood of accidents, in the vicinity of Valley End School. Highams Lane is not suitable for heavy traffic [*See paragraph 7.5*]
- 6.5 Proposal would cause noise and light pollution [*See paragraph 7.6*]
- 6.6 Proposal would be harmful to wildlife and biodiversity [*See paragraph 7.7*]
- 6.7 Economic development of this scale should not be in an unsustainable Green Belt and rural location and rather ought to be located within or adjoining a large urban centre. Proposal should be on an industrial site [*See paragraphs 7.4, 8.2 and 8.3*]
- 6.9 High quality design is a requirement for all proposals and does not constitute a benefit on a Green Belt site; an energy-efficient building is not a very special circumstance; and, screening, however effective, does not lessen the loss of openness [*See paragraph 8.5*]
- 6.10 The facilities may be unique but there is no need for them in this location. Benefits such as a museum, landscape enhancement and retention of existing buildings should attract little weight in favour of this application [*See paragraph 8.7*]
- 6.11 In respect of alternative sites the applicant has not considered and dismissed many options before turning to the application site [*See paragraph 8.4*]
- 6.12 Even minor development is resisted in the Green Belt and so permitting this proposal would set a precedent in the Green Belt and would be difficult to resist future Green Belt development [*Officer's comment: Each and every proposal has to be considered on its own merits based upon adopted policy and any other material considerations.*]
- 6.13 The proposal could lead to further potential infill development [*See paragraph 8.8*]
- 6.14 The need for the size of the buildings, the prestige and community support arguments should not weigh heavily in a decision as the site could still be used by a more intensive use in the future, if the applicant left the site. If the applicant vacates the site in the future what covenants will there be to prevent the site being used by a more obtrusive business? [*See paragraph 8.8*]

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATION

- 7.1 Policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF); and, Policies CP1, CP2, CP8, CP11, CP14A, DM1, DM7, DM9, DM10, DM11, DM13 and DM17 of the Surrey Heath Core

Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 (CSDMP) are relevant. Regard will also be had to advice contained in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG); the Council's 2020 Economic Development Strategy; and, The Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership Strategic Economic Plan 2014.

7.2 Policy DM13 of the CSDMP recognises that employment development can occur outside of the core employment centre and town centre and this policy's supporting text acknowledges that these uses can play an important role in the Borough's economy, often comprise large bespoke sites, and are not just confined to the urban area but also located in the Green Belt and countryside. Whilst the policy seeks to retain these uses, the policy restricts development on these sites to extensions or additions and promotes redevelopment where this would improve environmental and residential amenity. In principle, therefore, and given the site's established use there is no objection to the Class B1 use, subject to the merits of the proposal not causing material harm. As such, the following main issues need to be addressed in determining this application:

- Green Belt appropriateness and harm;
- Impacts on the character of the area, heritage, landscape and trees;
- Highway impacts;
- Impacts on residential amenity;
- Impacts on biodiversity;
- Other matters; and,
- Very Special Circumstances (see Section 8 of this report).

7.3 Green Belt appropriateness and harm

7.3.1 Paragraph 89 of the NPPF states that the construction of new buildings are inappropriate in the Green but lists exceptions including an extension to a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; and, limited infilling of previously developed sites 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. Paragraph 90 states that certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. This includes engineering operations.

7.3.2 In the officer's opinion the northern part of the site comprising the main building, the ancillary buildings and associated hardstanding is a previously developed site. The total size of the garage extension, wing extensions and monorail station (approximately 820 sq m) therefore represent a 6% increase in floor space when compared with the size of the existing buildings (12,630 sq m) and so can only be concluded to represent limited infilling. The location of the garage extension would also be over existing hardstanding and whilst the wings to the main building would spread development south over existing open land the size of these extensions would still not be disproportionate to the size of the main building. It is therefore considered that all these extensions, including the enlarged plant enclosure and the restaurant extension proposed under the outline submission would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

- 7.3.3 Buildings 1 and 2 and the other buildings proposed to the south of the existing buildings would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the applicant also accepts this. It is considered these buildings would cause significant harm to the openness of the Green Belt by virtue of their size and the spread of development on the land. This quantum of built form would also conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt by encroachment into the countryside.
- 7.3.4 However, the applicant is of the viewpoint that the engineering operations, namely the construction of the monorail and the test road would not be inappropriate development, complying with paragraph 90 of the NPPF not harming Green Belt openness (paragraph 7.11 of the Planning Statement refers). Contrary to this viewpoint, in the officer's opinion a fact and degree judgement must be made as to whether these operations preserve openness. Currently the land is open and devoid of any development. Therefore any development on this land is likely to have an urbanising effect. Whilst the test road would be at ground level and the rail track supports would be open in design, nevertheless they would not be contained at one side of the land or cover a small area but rather spread over the entire field parcels having a significant degree of hardstanding and rail track. This sprawl of development would inevitably have a permanent effect upon the open and undeveloped character that the land currently possesses. The associated movement of vehicles would further add to the impression of urbanity. It is therefore considered that these operations would not preserve openness, would conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt by failing to safeguard the countryside from encroachment and would therefore be inappropriate development.
- 7.3.5 The NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. It goes on to state that substantial weight ought to be given to any harm to the Green Belt and that very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. Before considering the applicant's very special circumstances it is therefore first necessary to consider whether in addition to the significant Green Belt harm this proposal causes any other harm. This is considered below.

7.4 Impacts on the character of the area, heritage, landscape and trees

- 7.4.1 The NPPF requires development to integrate into its natural, built and historic environments and Policy DM9 (ii) of the CSDMP reiterates this requiring development to respect and enhance the environment, paying particular attention to scale, materials, massing, bulk and density. Whilst the M3 motorway delineates the southern boundary of the site and the existing site buildings are commercial, the environmental character of the southern part of the site and wider area is predominantly rural, open and natural. The applicant's Landscape Design Statement describes a significant area of the site as having as an 'English Parkland' character, together with more intimate landscape areas associated with the existing buildings and areas of woodland adjacent to Highams Lane.
- 7.4.2 The development by reason of the use, size and location of the new buildings to the south being remote from the existing site buildings, together with the test track and monorail must result in a development that would fail to respect the existing rural, open and natural attributes that the area possesses, contrary to Policy DM9 (ii). Even if this conclusion is incorrect and the proposal respects its context, then in this high quality natural environment any development ought to enhance the environment and so it is difficult to argue that this would be the case. However, in the applicant's favour, the design of the new buildings to the south seek to integrate into this setting by including the sinking of the building into the landscape, natural materials and curved roofs to reflect site topography and the green roof. Whilst the scale of these buildings is significant the architecture therefore does help to

reduce the massing. This is best illustrated by the artist impressions.

- 7.4.3 Furthermore, existing views into the site are limited because of the high degree of natural boundary screening and the M3 embankment. The natural gradient changes on the site also limit views across the entire site. Given this existing context, the architecture, and given that much of the existing landscaping would be retained, the proposed buildings would not be prominent from outside the site. The creation of a new Highams Lane access would open up views but it is considered that the impact would be restricted to this point only. However, this access and its level of use would inevitably have a damaging effect upon the existing sense of rurality this road has and also impact on the experience of those who use the public bridleway which runs parallel to the southern boundary.
- 7.4.4 The applicant's proposed landscape enhancements are welcomed and, in particular, the restoration of the historic walled garden. The Council's Heritage Officer is supportive of the proposal concluding that there would be no harm to the locally listed building and given that the proposal can also be conditioned in respect of archaeology, the proposal would comply with Policy DM17. The Council's Tree Officer has also raised no objection as tree loss would be limited and that the loss of the category B and C trees would have a minor impact on the landscape character and profile of the area. Subject to suitable conditions to control tree works and a comprehensive landscape planting scheme it is considered that the proposal would provide the opportunity to provide a high quality landscaping, in compliance with Policy DM9 (iv).

7.5 Highway impacts

- 7.4.1 The applicant's Transport Assessment (TA) firstly considers the existing highway conditions i.e. the impacts of the existing lawful Class B1 use/extant permission and secondly, the proposed development against this baseline. The TA states that traffic impact has assessed on the worst case scenario. The TA's main findings are summarised below:
- Chertsey Road is an unrestricted rural road around 7.3m in width. Highams Lane is around 6.5m in width. Neither road has any footway or street lighting provision. Automatic traffic counts were carried out on Chertsey Road west of the site, Chertsey Road east of the site and Highams Lane adjacent to the M3 bridge to determine background traffic flows.
 - The proposed Highams Lane access has been designed to mitigate any impact on the existing tree line, ensure suitable visibility splays of 2.4 m x 120 m in both directions and to ensure that even the largest HGV would not obstruct the highway. All vehicles are able to enter and leave in a forward gear via the new access and track drawings have been provided.
 - The baseline assessments of the network travel flows show only single vehicles waiting to turn right into Highams Lane in the AM peak and no more than 2 vehicles waiting to exit Highams Lane in the PM peak. The TA concludes that the situation would remain unchanged with this proposal and no junction capacity issues.
 - Trip generation has been based on 90% car dependency. Existing trip distribution to the immediate road network has been calculated to represent the following proportions of traffic: Chertsey Road west of Highams Lane 66.2%; Chertsey Road east of Highams Lane 27.6%; and, Highams Lane 6.2%
 - Based upon this baseline trip distribution the TA calculates an 85 two-way increase AM (i.e. 8am – 9am) peak traffic flows (extant permission is 71 two-way flows) and 71 two-way increase PM (i.e. 5pm -6pm) peak traffic flows (extant permission is

101). This equates to:

- On Chertsey Road west of the site to less than 1 and 1 additional movement per minute, during the AM and PM peaks respectively;
 - On Chertsey Road east of the site to 1 additional movement every 2 minutes and 1 additional movement every 3 minutes, during the AM and PM peaks respectively; and,
 - On Highams Lane approximately 1 additional movement every 12 minutes in the AM peak and 1 additional movement every 15 minutes in the PM peak.
- Personal Injury Accident data was obtained from SCC from 1 January 2009 to 21 October 2014 with no accidents recorded at or near the Chertsey Road/Highams Lane junction.

7.5.3 For Class B1 developments the County's Parking Standards recommends a maximum range of 1 car space per 30m² to 1 car space per 100m² dependent on location, but this is based upon a floor area threshold of 2,500m². Therefore these standards cannot be readily applied to this proposal. Even if using these guidelines, whilst the existing site's parking for 209 vehicles equates to 1 space per 60m² this would have been based upon the historical situation when parking standards were different. It also has to be recognised that the intended use of the proposed site by a maximum of 350 staff would have a lower staff to floor space ratio than many other Class B1 uses. The provision of a total number of 261 parking spaces is therefore considered to be reasonable as this would equate to approximately 1 parking space per 100m²

7.5.4 Furthermore, reducing reliance on the use of the car and sustainable modes of travel should be encouraged, in line with the NPPF. Given that the site is not sustainably located (with Sunningdale the closest station 4km away and the closest bus stop and limited service in Windlesham approximately 1.6 km away and there are no dedicated cycle or footpath routes in the vicinity of the site) the need for alternative modes of transport should be promoted. Consequently the Travel Plan seeks to address the high dependency on the car by, for example, promoting car sharing and by the use of hybrid electric vehicles between stations and for business meetings.

7.5.4 During the course of the application, an updated and amended TA and Travel Plan were submitted by the applicant's transport consultants, following detailed discussion held with the County Highways Authority. On the basis all the evidence, the County Highways Authority raise no objection to the development subject to conditions including a Construction Transport Management Plan, parking conditions and Travel Plan condition. The Highways Agency also raise no objection. The development is therefore considered to be acceptable on highway capacity, safety and parking grounds, complying with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the CSDMP.

7.6 Impacts on residential amenity

7.6.1 Along the Highams Lane boundaries the closest residential properties include Highams Lodge, The Cottage and The Lake House. It is considered that the amenity of these neighbours would be most affected by the scheme given that the principal development works would be at the eastern end of the site. However, all of these residential properties would be some distance away from the new buildings, for example The Lake House is approximately 180 m away from the northern elevation of building 1 and so it is considered that there would not be a direct loss of residential amenity for these residents by reason of loss of privacy, overlooking, light or visual impacts. Whilst residents would be affected by the increased traffic movements using the lane, the aforementioned highway evidence suggests that the impacts would not be significantly adverse. Furthermore, Highams Lodge

is located adjacent to the existing staff access and so it is considered that there would not be a dissimilar impact for this neighbour than the existing extant situation.

- 7.6.2 Highams Lane properties would be the closest properties to the monorail track, which at its closest point would be some 25 metres away from the eastern boundary. Residents raise concerns over the elevated nature of the track (ranging between 0-5 metres in height above ground level) and the main station (approximately 5 metres in height above ground level). Despite this, in the officer's opinion the impacts from the monorail on residential amenities would not be adverse. This is because the eastern elevation of the existing main building is already raised on an embankment and the monorail station would be visually read against this. The track itself would have an open design and be effectively screened by the existing landscaping to be retained along the boundary. In addition, the elevated nature of the track would not be for the entire length of Highams Lane but drop down to be close to ground level.
- 7.6.3 There are a number of residential properties located along Chertsey Road, to the west of the site, of which the closest dwellings with curtilages adjoining the application site include Scarlett Hollies and Orchard Cottage. These two dwellings are located adjacent to the walled garden and remote from the main proposed development works and so given the proposed improvements to landscaping and restoration of the walled garden it is considered there would be no adverse impact on these neighbours' amenities. To an extent these neighbours' properties plus dwellings including, for example Gunners Meadows and Lynbrook Cottage, would also be affected by the outline development works namely the extended test road and monorail. However, given the separation distances and given the quiet electric nature of the use of these facilities it is considered there would be no adverse impact.
- 7.6.4 South of the M3 motorway the closest property is Rose Cottage, some 70+ metres away. Given this significant separation distance, the existing motorway embankment and screening it is considered that there would be no adverse impact on this neighbour's amenities.
- 7.6.5 In addition to the above conclusions, the applicant's Noise Assessment carried out baseline noise survey data at three locations around the proposed development nearest to the closest residential properties including: 1. Scarlett Hollies/Orchard Cottage; 2. Highams Lodge; and, 3. The Cottage/The Lake House. This evidence looked at the constructional and operational impacts of the development including the test road and workshop buildings. The Council's EHO sought further information relating to the monorail. The expected frequency of the monorail would be one per hour with a maximum speed of 50km/h. According to the EHO the noise generation is expected to be less than a conventional bus or HGVs that current residents are exposed to from the road use. The EHO concludes that there would be no adverse noise impacts for residential properties. This proposal would therefore be in compliance with paragraph 123 of the NPPF and the Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE).
- 7.6.6 The applicant's Lighting Report confirms that the test road would not be illuminated at dark and where lighting is necessary this would use LED marker lights or be controlled by sensors. The Council's EHO raises no objections commenting that the report is in accordance with guidelines. It is considered reasonable to impose conditions relating to lighting so that the full details can be submitted. It is therefore considered that there would be no adverse impact of light pollution on local residents, in accordance with paragraph 125 of the NPPF. The EHO also confirms that the proposal would not cause adverse air quality issues, consistent with paragraph 124 of the NPPF.

7.6.5 As such it is considered that the proposal would not result in adverse loss of residential amenity and would comply with Policy DM9 (iii) of the CSDMP.

7.7 Impacts on biodiversity

7.7.1 Policy CP14 of the CSDMP seeks to conserve and enhance biodiversity and does not permit development that would result in harm to or loss of features of interest for biodiversity. Despite the relative proximity of the site to areas of local, national and international importance it is a material consideration that Natural England raises no objection to the impact of this proposal. It is therefore concluded that the proposal would not be harmful to the THBSPA, SAC and SSSI.

7.7.2 In respect of site specific ecology, the SWT advises that the ecological survey information only considers the full application and not the outline part of the site. SWT therefore recommends that the applicant should undertake all the recommended actions in section 7 of the Ecological Assessment, including the biodiversity enhancements. SWT advises that a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) also ought to be considered. In the officer's opinion it is reasonable to condition these requirements, which would be in accordance with the NPPF and Circular 06/2005.

7.8 Other matters

7.8.1 Given that the site lies outside the floodplain and given no objection raised by the EA the proposal would cause no fluvial flood risk and complies with Policy DM10 of the CSDMP. Neither does the proposal pose contamination risks. In respect of surface water drainage the Government in April 2015 changed requirements for major developments for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). Under these requirements the Council must be satisfied during determination of the application that SuDS can be designed into a proposal, unless demonstrated to be inappropriate. Whilst the EA and Thames Water recommend conditions in respect of a drainage strategy, it is therefore recommended that such conditions are not imposed until the comments from the Council's Drainage Engineer are received. An update will be reported at the meeting.

7.8.2 The application is not CIL liable because CIL only applies to residential or retail uses. Furthermore, in line with paragraph 204 of the NPPF planning obligations should only be sought where they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. No such requirements have been identified.

8.0 VERY SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

8.1 On the basis of the Green Belt inappropriateness and significant harm to openness identified in paragraph 7.3 above; and, other harm to the character of the area identified in paragraph 7.4 it is necessary to consider whether this overall harm can be outweighed. The applicant's main very special circumstances to justify the development are summarised below, the merits of each will be considered in turn and then in combination:

- (i) Economic contribution and prestige
- (ii) Employment provision and the wider benefits including education and training

- (iii) Need for the development and lack of alternative sites
- (iv) Design quality, innovation and operational linkages
- (v) Unique facilities and building scale
- (vi) Community support and benefits including landscape enhancement and reuse of existing building.

8.2 (i) Economic contribution and prestige

8.2.1 The NPPF has a presumption in favour of sustainable development of which there are three dimensions i.e. economic, social and environmental. The economic role is *'contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure.'* In order to deliver a strong and competitive economy paragraphs 18-20 of the NPPF states the following:

18. The Government is committed to securing economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity, building on the country's inherent strengths, and to meet the twin challenges of global competition and of a low carbon future.

19. The Government is committed to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight [Officer's underlining] should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system.

20. To help achieve economic growth, local planning authorities should plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century.

8.2.2 In respect of having an economy fit for the 21st century the applicant makes references to a number of Government publications (e.g. Creating a Future for 2020 Vision for Science and Research - May 2014 - Department for Business, Innovation and Skills) that support research and development (R&D), high tech engineering skills, science and innovation and the importance of their contribution to future economic growth. At a regional level the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) for Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) emphasises the M3 motorway corridor as a growth area being the primary science and technology corridor in the UK, an economic asset of national importance and a global leader in a range of sector and activities, capitalising on industrial strengths and the world-class research, with high value added economic activities generated by academia and businesses working closely together. Finally, at a local level the Council's 2020 Economic Development Strategy recognises the importance of specialist engineering firms and aims to support their growth aspirations.

8.2.3 The applicant considers this proposal to be entirely consistent with this national, regional and local economic policy for the reasons summarised below:

- The applicant has a global brand, outreach and presence. The group welcomes high-level delegations from all over the globe including prime ministers and senior ministers from other countries. This global recognition results in significant economic influx into the region, in the region of millions of pounds annually, with Fraser Nash and associated companies' products deployed across multiple

continents.

- The applicant has a long and illustrious history dating back to the 1920s and is a world leader in R&D of sustainable electric and hybrid technologies. The group of companies and facilities provided at Kamkorp Park would be a prestigious addition to the range of companies based in Surrey Heath. The prestige of names such as Bristol Motors, Metrocab and Frazer-Nash are of international recognition and to be able to refer to such well known and historic names as based in Surrey Heath will bring tremendous economic benefit and prestige to the Borough.
- The motor industry generally, and particularly motorsport, is a growth area. The industry has not been seriously affected by the global financial crisis and subsequent recession in the UK, nor will it be affected by ongoing public sector spending cuts. The economic benefit extends beyond the district to the rest of the South East and the country as a whole. It is hugely valuable to the economy and its contribution to GDP to export performance, to jobs and to UK's international reputation as a location for innovative, technology lead businesses. Motorsport is understood to include around 4,500 firms with an annual turnover of £6bn of which £3.6bn is exported. Collectively the industry supports nearly 40,000 jobs, of which 25,000 are qualified engineers.
- The growth of Frazer-Nash will put the Borough on the map by having an industry that has agglomeration benefits, and the multiplier effect, as neighbouring and locally-based businesses, such as McLaren in Woking and TAG in Farnborough continue to grow and advance the specialist engineering footprint across the area.

8.2.4 Whilst the prestigious of the applicant's brand is understood, officers requested the applicant to provide quantification and future projection of what the economic benefit would be. For example, as an indicator baseline financial detail on what benefit the existing Mytchett business has had in the Borough; and, comparative studies of how companies such as TAG has benefited Rushmoor, or McLaren in Woking. Whilst this has not been provided by the applicant, the applicant has nevertheless provided useful further explanation as to why this business sector is so important to the economy. Even without being able to quantify the actual local benefit, the aforementioned economic policy documents supporting this type of industry and the associated applicant's evidence still weighs heavily in favour of the proposal. The applicant's R&D of electric technologies is entirely consistent with the Government's twin challenges of global competition and a low carbon future. Therefore, this proposal would undoubtedly support economic growth, and is likely to become even more important in future years, and so significant weight must be given to this in accordance with paragraphs 18-20 of the NPPF.

8.3 (ii) Employment provision and the wider benefits including education and training

8.3.1 According to the applicant the development would eventually have up to approximately 350 total employees working at the site. This direct job creation would be up to 40 newly skilled jobs immediately. Initially some staff from Mytchett Place would be relocated to help seed the site. The skills breakdown in relation to jobs created is 47% skilled (engineering); 25% semi-skilled (engineering); 7% unskilled; 18% operational; and, 3% managerial. The applicant also states that employment would be created during construction with a preference for local builders and contractors and indirect employment as a result of increased expenditure on goods and services, because of the agglomeration benefits and growth of specialist engineering in the area and the associated multiplier effects. By supporting local employment opportunities the applicant considers that the development maintains local workforce

8.3.2 Furthermore, the applicant is committed for people to live and work within the Borough and

to facilitate this by developing apprenticeships and links with schools and colleges in the Borough and region. The applicant already has existing links with Collingwood College, Imperial, Oxford and Cambridge University through sponsorship schemes, graduate recruitment, internships and apprenticeships.

8.3.3 The applicant's justification is further supported by evidence provided by the Council's Economic Development Officer. Namely, research shows that each filled job in Surrey contributes around £51,000 to the UK economy in GVA (Gross Value Added), significantly higher than the national average of £39,000. Thus, the direct employment from this proposal could amount to £17.85 million to the UK economy, of which there would inevitably be knock on benefits to the Borough and region by virtue of indirect job creation and economic growth. Policy CP8 of the CSDMP seeks to provide up to 7,500 new jobs for the period up to 2027 and the proposal would support this. It is therefore considered that the employment opportunities weigh significantly in favour of the proposal, in accordance with paragraphs 18-20 of the NPPF.

8.4 (iii) Need for the development and lack of alternative sites

8.4.1 Summarised below is the applicant reasoning for why new accommodation is needed in this location, why specialist bespoke accommodation is needed and why no other alternatives exist:

- The applicant wishes to continue the evolution of the company in the Borough and build on the growing regional economic development, such as McLaren, to work closely with its supply chains and invest in, strengthen and build up network and resources in the area;
- Given its worldwide market the applicant has a growing need for state of the art technology park and a worldwide headquarters;
- Mytchett Place is not capable of accommodating the existing requirements with the test track too small and future growth potential of the Kamkorp Group of Companies;
- The companies are inter-dependent to each other and the buildings and facilities must be linked so that R&D can be undertaken in an innovative and collaborative working environment;
- The proposed short distance between the R&D facilities and the test track is important. It is not possible to be located within the urban area within an existing industrial unit and commute to a test track such (but not limited to) e.g. Silverstone, Brands Hatch or, perhaps somewhere like Dunsfold Aerodrome (in each case restrictions may apply in relation to vehicle testing);
- A traditional business park location is unsuitable for the particular R&D business needs of Kamkorp, compounded by the need for security with products kept out of the public eye;
- There are no other available or viable sites in the Borough or close by that would deliver the applicant's needs. Fair Oaks Airport is not available and other sites reviewed included Cody Technology Park, Farnborough; Longcross Test Track; and, Minley Manor.

8.4.2 As part of building a strong and competitive economy, paragraph 21 of the NPPF encourages planning positively for the location, promotion and expansion of clusters or

networks of knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries. The applicant's need for a bespoke cluster of companies and accommodation under one umbrella site is therefore consistent with the NPPF. Splitting up the facilities would also be fundamentally at odds with the applicant's own business model to develop electric vehicles and sustainable modes of transport. In respect of alternatives it is regrettable that Fairoaks is not available, particularly given its closer location to McLaren. Neither has the applicant explained in detail as to why these alternative locations are not available or viable. In addition, whilst the applicant has explained the essential need for the on-site test track, no explanation has been provided for the monorail. The assumption is that the monorail is equally essential to having all facilities at one location but the onus is on the applicant to justify this. Despite this, it is still preferable that the company remains within the Borough than outside. Given that the applicant is multi-national it could have easily relocated its headquarters in North America or elsewhere abroad but the applicant's commitment to remain in the Borough is welcomed. It is therefore considered that on the basis of the information submitted, the applicant's need arguments and lack of alternatives moderately weigh in favour of the proposal.

8.5 (iv) Design quality, innovation and operational linkages

- 8.5.1 The applicant states that any new building is required to be high quality in order to match with the worldwide brand. An iconic building with high quality open parkland landscaped setting is important to the company. The applicant also explains that it is essential that the facilities inspire and promote collaborative and innovative thinking, and whilst an industrial unit within a business park may meet a functional need it is typically not an inspirational location to encourage creative and original thought.
- 8.5.2 It is considered that high quality design is not limited to the desirable needs of an applicant but has wider importance for the environment and, in any event, should be a pre-requisite of any proposal, particularly a development of this size. The NPPF requires good design and that securing high design and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations and includes how new development integrates into the natural, built and historic environment.
- 8.5.3 Paragraph 63 of the NPPF states that in determining applications, great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which help raises the standard of design more generally in the area. Whilst the individual architecture of building 1 is of the highest quality it is considered that the design is not so exceptional, or in the type of location where it could otherwise act as a catalyst for improving design in an area more generally. The architects have sought to integrate the design into its natural environment by, for example, by being dug into the ground to reduce prominence, the use of curved roofs to assimilate the topography and a green roof to blend into the landscape. However, the integration of a building into its setting and its degree of visual prominence does not reduce the harm to openness, as whether seen or unseen the quantum of built form in the Green Belt remains. This is because the primary indicator of harm to openness is an assessment of size. Similarly an energy efficient and green building should be a pre-requisite of any development of this size and so cannot be said to outweigh Green Belt harm. Whilst, therefore, the applicant's commercial needs for an iconic building and an environment which facilitates thinking is understood it is considered that this carries only limited weight in favour of the proposal.

8.6 (v) Unique facilities and building scale

- 8.6.1 The applicant explains how the buildings would accommodate unique facilities which would be of national and worldwide significance. This would include multi-fuel hybrid test cells for engines which would be unique and already generating significant interest from around the

world. The applicant states that the importance of this test facility cannot be understated. This would complement the existing single fuel test cell at Mytchett is already used by major car companies from Europe and the US and accelerate the development of zero emission fuels such as hydrogen. Other facilities would include an Electric Magnetic Compatibility Chamber for the testing of motor vehicles which would be the only one in the South East and be beneficial to local universities and institutions who are developing innovative electrical systems and components. The dedicated test track, for electric vehicles, would also be the only one in the country.

- 8.6.2 The applicant justifies the building scale because of the space requirements for these facilities and for R&D prototype purposes a large amount of space is required for only a few vehicles to be worked on. There would also only be a low ratio of workers within the floor area with the majority of space taken up by tools, machinery and the product. Consequently the applicant explains that this requires a site that is well contained which offers the ability for new buildings to be in close association with each other to enable products to be researched, developed and tested on site. With such sites limited, the applicant states that in order to stay within the Borough it is an inevitability that an undeveloped site will be required, just like what happened at Woking with McLaren.
- 8.6.3 The uniqueness of the facilities, particularly with the worldwide major car company interest, does add to the importance of the proposal and the associated knock on effects this would have on the economy. In the officer's opinion this therefore adds weight in favour of the proposal.

8.7 (vi) Community support and benefits including landscape enhancement and reuse of existing building

- 8.7.1 According to the applicant the feedback (21 questionnaire responses) from the consultation event was that the majority of local residents were supportive of the development proposals; pleased to see the site in active use again, welcoming the idea of historic names, such as Bristol Motors being based locally, and in favour of the unique range of facilities and occupiers. The applicant explains that primarily the showcase facility and museum in building 1 is for invited visitors. However, it would also be open to members of the public and local community to visit on a limited number of days per year, reflecting comments made by local residents that they would welcome such a commitment. The applicant states that any potential opening could be controlled by condition. The applicant would also support corporate hospitality events not just for Kamkorp companies, but for other local businesses and organisations. The applicant also argues that the reuse of a redundant building back into the active use and the landscape enhancements would benefit the community.
- 8.7.2 By bringing the community and corporate activities to the site, it could be argued that the showcase and museum facility here is not a benefit at all as rather it would further urbanise the site by virtue of the increased comings and goings, and so be more damaging to the Green Belt. It is therefore considered on the basis of the information provided only limited weight ought to be given to the community benefits.
- 8.7.3 The applicant explains how a comprehensive landscape strategy would include infilling gaps in boundary landscaping; providing new landscaping to ensure the longevity of the landscape setting; screening for adjoining residents, in particular the north west corner of the site; enhance biodiversity; and, include the restoration of the walled garden with a replanting of the orchard and new planting to recreate the historic parkland. Clearly, this landscape strategy is welcomed and in particular the restoration of the walled garden which once formed part of the convent. However, landscape enhancement should be an expectation with any application of this size and so providing this cannot be said to be unique or very special. In this instance the landscape enhancement would be mostly site

contained and so benefits to the wider community for enjoyment of this landscape, for recreation or otherwise, would not be felt. It must also be noted that land is designated as green belt land irrespective of its landscape quality and so improving a landscape cannot somehow then be used as an argument to justify development. It is therefore considered that landscape enhancement carries very limited weight in support of the proposal.

- 8.7.4 The applicant states that the existing building's unique layout has meant that it has stood vacant for 7 years, unable to find an occupier. As such it has fallen into disrepair and neglect. The applicant, however, will secure the future of the building, retain its existing character and bring it up to modern standards and explains that this alone is a significant financial investment. In the officer's opinion the retention and refurbishment of the main building is desirable. However, for all of the main building's architectural merits it is not statutory or locally listed and neither is it a community asset that is essential to retain in the Borough. Furthermore, and most importantly, the future retention of the main building does not in turn justify the quantum of new proposed development in the Green Belt. Again this carries very limited weight in the support of the proposal.

8.8 In combination consideration of (i) – (vi)

- 8.8.1 Of the very special circumstances presented by the applicant limited weight can be given to (iv) Design quality, innovation and operational linkages; and, (vi) Community support and benefits including landscape enhancement and reuse of existing building. Moderate weight can be given to (iii) Need for the development and lack of alternative sites; and, (v) Unique facilities and building scale. However, significant weight can be given to (i) Economic contribution and prestige; and, (ii) Employment provision and the wider benefits including education and training.
- 8.8.2 Whilst alone (i) - (vi) does not justify the development, in the officer's opinion the combined weight of these very special circumstances marginally outweigh the significant harm to the Green Belt and other harm. It is considered that the applicant's contribution to the local, regional and national economy, particularly in a growth worldwide industry that will become increasingly important in the future, tips the balance in favour of support. In coming to this difficult conclusion regard has been had to whether permitting this development would set a precedent in the Green Belt, or in the event that the applicant vacated the site result in future development that would be even more harmful.
- 8.8.3 However, it is considered that the proposal is genuinely unique and so other developments elsewhere in the Green Belt would still have to be considered on their own merits being subject to the same stringent Green Belt control. In respect of the applicant's commitment to the site, it must be borne in mind that the applicant is investing significantly into this development and so the likelihood of the applicant leaving the site in the short term is unlikely. The fact that the applicant has been at Mytchett for many years further highlights the commitment to the Borough. Even if the applicant did sell up and vacate the site then the nature of the development would only lend itself to other R&D companies of a similar business model so bringing comparable benefits to the Borough. The concerns over the site opening itself up for any kind of Class B1 use, or other development, are therefore unfounded. Whilst the use goes with the land and so it is unreasonable to impose personal consent conditions, it is nevertheless necessary and reasonable to add an element of additional control by imposing conditions restricting the use to Class B1 only and limiting the number of staff on site. As such the integrity of the Borough's Green Belt would be retained.

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

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 the following:

- 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.
- 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.
- c) Have negotiated and accepted amendments to the scheme to resolve identified problems with the proposal and to seek to foster sustainable development.
- d) Have proactively communicated with the applicant through the process to advise progress, timescale or recommendation.

10.0 CONCLUSION

- 10.1 The proposal by reason of the new buildings, plus the test road and monorail, would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and cause significant harm to the openness of the Green Belt and conflict with its purposes. By association, the development would also cause harm to the existing rural, natural and undeveloped character of the area. The development would therefore conflict with policies CP1, CP2 and DM9 of the CSDMP. However, in the officer's opinion the in-combination weight of the very special circumstances, and in particular the economic arguments, are also significant and, on balance, outweigh the harm and justify this development. Officers therefore recommend approval.

11.0 RECOMMENDATION

REFER to the Secretary of State for approval subject to:-

1. Approval of the details of the layout, scale, appearance, access and the landscaping of the site under the outline application (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development, subject to the outline permission, is commenced.

(a) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority within three years of the date of this permission.

(b) The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

Reason: To prevent an accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions and to comply with Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 2010 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order) and Section 92(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 (2) of the Planning and the Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted for the full planning application 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.

3. The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the approved plans all as listed in the Design and Access Statement plus additional drawing nos. TP600, TP 601 and QD655_200_01 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 Planning Practice Guidance.

4. No development shall take place until details and samples of the external materials to be used shall be 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.

5. For the avoidance of doubt, the development hereby permitted shall be used for Class B1 use as defined by the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order), and for no other use unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason: To retain control in the interests of the Green Belt, the character of the area and residential amenities and to comply with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies and the NPPF.

6. The museum and showcase facility approved in building 1 shall only be used as ancillary to the Class B1 use hereby permitted and not be occupied independent to this use. Prior to first occupation full details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority as to the number of days the museum and showcase facility will be open to the public including management of visitors and the frequency of corporate and charity events. Thereafter there shall be no amendment from these approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason: To retain control in the interests of the Green Belt, the character of the area and residential amenities and to comply with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies and the NPPF.

7. There shall be no more than 350 staff employed at the development hereby permitted unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason: To retain control in the interests of the Green Belt and highway capacity and to comply with Policies CP1, CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies and the NPPF.

8. Buildings 1 and 2 (i.e. the full planning application) hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the approved plans for vehicles and cycles to be parked and for the loading and unloading of vehicles and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. Thereafter the parking, loading and unloading, and turning area(s) shall be retained and maintained for their designated purpose(s).

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in compliance with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and in recognition of Section 4 "Promoting Sustainable Transport" in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

9. The outline development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for vehicles and cycles to be parked and for the loading and unloading of vehicles and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. Thereafter the parking, loading and unloading, and turning area(s) shall be retained and maintained for their designated purpose(s).

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in compliance with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and in recognition of Section 4 "Promoting Sustainable Transport" in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

10. No development shall commence until a Construction Transport Management Plan, 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) vehicle routing
 - (e) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway
 - (f) on-site turning for construction vehicles
- has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction of the development.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in compliance with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and in recognition of Section 4 "Promoting Sustainable Transport" in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

11. On first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the application Travel Plan titled "Kamkorp Park Chertsey Road Windlesham Surrey GU20 6HZ - Staff Travel Plan" version 2.4, dated 25 March 2015, by RBM Consulting shall be implemented and thereafter retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor

cause inconvenience to other highway users in compliance with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and in recognition of Section 4 “Promoting Sustainable Transport” in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

12. The full application hereby permitted shall be undertaken in strict accordance with the mitigation and enhancement measures set out in Section 7 of the applicant's Ecological Assessment Report (Pell Frischmann), details of which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority prior to commencement of works. This shall also include the submission of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan. Once approved there shall be no variation from the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason: To comply with Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the NPPF.

13. 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 ACS Consulting and dated January 2015.

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.

14.
 1. *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 submitted details should also include an indication of all level alterations, hard surfaces, walls, fences, access features, the existing trees and hedges to be retained, together with the new planting to be carried out and shall build upon the aims and objectives of the supplied **BS5837:2012 – Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction** Arboricultural Method Statement [AMS].*
 2. *All hard and soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. All hard and soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. All plant material shall conform to **BS3936:1992 Parts 1 – 5: Specification for Nursery Stock. Handling, planting and establishment of trees shall be in accordance with **BS 8545:2014 Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape*****
 3. *A landscape management plan including maintenance schedules for all landscape areas shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before first occupation of the development or any phase of the development, whichever is the sooner, for its permitted use. The schedule shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation. The landscape areas shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed landscape management plan for a minimum period of 5 years.*

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.

15. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the local planning authority detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: The current and future uses of the site could involve polluting substance which may impact water quality. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 109 states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of water pollution. Government policy also states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is presented (NPPF, paragraph 121).

16. No infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground is permitted other than with the express written consent of the Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to controlled waters. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To accord with paragraph 109 of the NPPF to prevent unacceptable levels of water pollution.

17. No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological works in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of heritage and to accord with Policy DM17 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

18. Prior to commencement of development hereby permitted a comprehensive lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. This shall include details of all external lighting including manufacturers specifications, automatic sensor controls and timers, hours of illumination and light spillage diagrams. The approved details shall be fully implemented prior to first occupation of new buildings, or with a phasing plan agreed by the Planning Authority, and thereafter there shall be no changes unless otherwise agreed.

Reason: To limit light pollution in the interests of the rural character of the area, residential amenities and nature conservation and to comply with Policies DM9 and CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the NPPF.

19. There shall be no variation to the proposal land levels as detailed on drawing numbers TP005A, 006A, 107A, 305A, 306A and 401A unless otherwise agreed in

writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason: To retain control in the interests of the character of the area and the openness of the Green Belt and to comply with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

Informative(s)

1. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out any works on the highway. The applicant is advised that prior approval must be obtained from the Highway Authority before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, or verge to form a vehicle crossover or to install dropped kerbs. Please see www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-permits-and-licences/vehicle-crossovers-or-dropped-kerbs.
2. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out any works that may affect a drainage channel/culvert or water course. The applicant is 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-advice.
3. 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).
4. When access is required to be 'completed' before any other operations, the Highway Authority may agree that surface course material and in some cases edge restraint may be deferred until construction of the development is complete, provided all reasonable care is taken to protect public safety.
5. The developer 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.
6. The applicant is advised that the landscaping planting scheme should not just mitigate for tree loss but also address the age class differentiation throughout the site and broaden species diversity. Any scheme will need to include semi mature trees with minimum 25-30cm girth at 1m (nominal 8.8cm diameter). Any additional removal of vegetation, not expressly indicated on the Tree Protection Plan, should be discussed with the Council's Tree Officer and replacement planting integrated into the landscaping scheme potentially by way of copse establishment within open areas.
7. The applicant is advised that in respect of foundation design vegetation related clay shrinkage subsidence has been reported in the area. Accordingly, suitable foundations should be provided (pile / pier and beam etc.) that will allow for future differential movement from potential desiccation of subsoil or indeed heave from

the removal of significant trees which predate any agreed construction.

8. With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0800 009 3921.
9. Where a developer proposes to discharge groundwater into a public sewer, a groundwater discharge permit will be required. Groundwater discharges typically result from construction site dewatering, deep excavations, basement infiltration, borehole installation, testing and site remediation. Groundwater permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team by telephoning 020 8507 4890 or by emailing wwqriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk. Application forms should be completed on line via www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991.
10. The applicant is reminded of Natural England's standing advice in respect of species protection and if any protected species are found on the site that the appropriate licence be obtained.