

**LOCATION:** 4 FRIMLEY ROAD, CAMBERLEY, GU15 3BA  
**PROPOSAL:** The erection of 1 residential building to provide 16 two bedroom apartments with associated parking following the demolition of the existing two houses and flats. (Amended plans recv'd 14/8/15)  
**TYPE:** Full Planning Application  
**APPLICANT:** Hodson Developments (Camberley) Ltd  
**OFFICER:** Emma Pearman

**RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to legal agreement and conditions**

## 1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 The application site is on the north end of Frimley Road near the junction with the A30, on the western side of the road. It is situated between three blocks of recently built apartments, and is on the site of three terraced properties which have now been demolished. The proposal is for one five-storey residential building which would provide 16 two-bedroom apartments. Its scale and design is very similar to the three surrounding blocks, although it is slightly smaller in depth.
- 1.2 The proposal is considered to be acceptable in character terms and will be an improvement on the streetscene compared to the three terraced cottages that were previously on site. Objections were made with regard to the impact on residential amenity for adjoining neighbours, however following the submission of amended plans, it is considered that there would now be no adverse impact. The proposal is acceptable in all other regards and subject to receiving a SAMM payment or the provision of a legal agreement to secure a SAMM payment by the due date, it is recommend that permission be granted.

## 2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site is located on the western side of Frimley Road, close to the junction with London Road. The site formerly comprised three terraced cottages, one of which was divided into two maisonettes, however these have now been demolished. The application site is located between three other five-storey residential buildings comprising a number of flats. One of these buildings known as Belgravia Mansions (referred to by the applicant as Block A), is located facing the London Road and is occupied, while Block B is to the south of the application site along Frimley Road, and Block C to the south of Block B. Blocks B and C while mostly constructed are not yet occupied. Development on the opposite side of Frimley Road mostly comprises a row of shops with accommodation above.
- 2.2 The application site falls within the A30 Commercial Corridor Character Area, as identified by the Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

### **3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY**

- 3.1 SU13/0146 - Former Duke of York 371 London Road and Yorktown House, 8 Frimley Road - Erection of 3 five-storey buildings to provide 10 one bed and 75 two bedroom and 2 three bedroom flats with parking (partly undercroft), landscaping and access following the demolition of existing buildings.

*Refused 25/10/2013 but allowed on appeal (reference APP/D3640/A/13/2209994) on 13/06/2014*

- 3.2 SU13/0832 - Former Duke of York 371 London Road and Yorktown House, 8 Frimley Road - Outline planning permission for the erection of 3 five-storey buildings to provide 10 one bed and 75 two bedroom and 2 three bedroom flats with parking (partly undercroft), landscaping and access following the complete demolition of Yorktown House (access, landscaping and layout only to be considered).

*Granted 11/02/2014, however the above permission has been implemented instead.*

### **4.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 4.1 The proposal is for the erection of one five-storey residential building to provide 16 two-bedroom apartments with associated parking, following the demolition of the existing two houses and two maisonettes. At basement level there would be two flats, parking and bicycle storage; three flats at ground, 1st, 2nd and 3rd floor levels; and two within the roofspace on the 4th floor.
- 4.2 The building would be 22.2m in width and a maximum of 13.4m in depth. It would have an eaves height of 12.3m, and total height of 14.2m as there would be some flats provided in the roofspace. There would be an additional 2.8m in height at basement level. The building would have a flat roof, with balconies on many of the windows on the front and rear elevations, and corner balconies on the north and south flank elevations. Materials would be yellow facing brick and white render, and it would be very similar in appearance and height to Blocks A, B and C already constructed.
- 4.3 Parking would be provided at one space per apartment, behind the basement level to the rear, and under the existing car park constructed for the use of Block A, with cycle storage also provided. Vehicular access would be via an entrance to the rear on Sullivan Road, which has already been given permission under the 2014 appeal decision for access to parking areas for Blocks B and C.

### **5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

- 5.1 Surrey County Highway Authority - No objection subject to conditions.
- 5.2 Head of Environmental Services - Response awaited and will be reported at the meeting.
- 5.3 Thames Water - No objection subject to informative.
- 5.4 Surrey Wildlife Trust - No objection, subject to condition.
- 5.5 Council's Arboricultural Officer - No objection, subject to condition.
- 5.6 Lead Local Flood Authority - Response awaited and will be reported at the meeting.

5.7 Council's Viability Consultant - No affordable housing contribution required..

## 6.0 REPRESENTATION

6.1 At the time of preparation of this report 9 letters of objection have been received, summarised below:

### Amenity

- Will cause overlooking and overshadowing of neighbouring apartments, particularly Block A (Belgravia Mansions) [see paragraph 7.6]
- Does not provide sufficient amenity space especially for basement units and no children's play space provided [see 7.6]
- Construction work on the current site has been outside normal hours and noise impacts on amenity [see 7.6].

### Highways, Parking and Access

- Traffic difficulties will be caused and cumulative impacts of traffic as a result of the development are severe [see 7.7]
- Impact of development on existing parking for Block A (Belgravia Mansions) and some parking spaces would be difficult to manoeuvre in and out of [see 7.7]
- Detrimental to pedestrian and highway safety especially around Frimley Road/A30 junction [see 7.7]
- Will lead to increased demand for public transport which has not been assessed [see 7.7].

### Landscaping

- Loss of landscaped strip and not enough landscaping around building [see 7.8].

### Character

- Does not respect existing streetscene on Frimley Road [see 7.5]
- Would project forward of the adjoining blocks and setback is contrary to Principle YK3 of the Yorktown Landscape Strategy SPD [Officer comment: this principle does not apply to this area of Frimley Road]
- Will result in overdevelopment of the site with a very high density of dwellings per hectare [see 7.5]

### Other matters

- Not enough refuse bins proposed [Officer comment: no objection has been received from the Environmental Health Officer, any response will be reported at the meeting]
- Viability of affordable housing should be assessed as a whole including the permission for Blocks A, B & C and not just this scheme alone [see 7.4]

- Does not comply with policies in the Yorktown Landscape Strategy SPD, particularly those relating to soft landscaping, flooding, biodiversity and amenity, and residential enhancement [*Officer comment: Where Yorktown Landscape Strategy SPD policies are relevant, they have been taken into account below.*]

## **7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 The application proposed is considered against the policies within the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012, and in this case the relevant policies are Policies CP1, CP2, CP3, CP5, CP6, CP11, CP12, CP14, DM9 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 (CSDMP); the Guiding Principles of the A30 Commercial Area Character Area set out in the Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document, the Yorktown Landscape Strategy Supplementary Planning Document, Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009 (as saved); the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Supplementary Planning Document 2012, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

7.2 The main issues to be considered are listed below:

- Principle of the development;
- Affordable housing and housing mix;
- Impact on character;
- Impact on residential amenity;
- Highways, access and parking;
- Trees, landscaping and ecology;
- Impact on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA; and,
- Other matters including drainage.

### **7.3 Principle of the development**

7.3.1 Policy CP1 states that new development will come forward largely through redevelopment of previously developed land in the western part of the Borough, and that Camberley has scope for residential development across the area. Policy CP2 requires all land to be used efficiently within the context of its surroundings, respecting and enhancing the quality of the local environment. Policy CP3 states that housing will be provided by promoting the use of previously developed land within settlement areas and making the most effective use of that land, with the highest percentage of dwellings expected to be in Camberley (excluding Princess Royal Barracks redevelopment in Deepcut). Paragraph 17 of the NPPF also encourages the efficient use of previously developed land and the focus of development in sustainable locations.

7.3.2 The use of the site is already residential, as are the surrounding buildings and as such there is no objection to the redevelopment of the site for residential use. The site previously provided 4 residential units and therefore the redevelopment of the site for 16 units is in accordance with Policy CP2 and the NPPF in that it results in an efficient use of previously developed land.

The site is located in a highly sustainable location close to Camberley Town Centre, and easily accessible by public transport and cars and within walking distance of shops and community facilities.

- 7.3.3 It is therefore considered that the principle of the development is acceptable and the proposal is in accordance with Policies CP1, CP2, CP3 and the NPPF in this regard.

#### **7.4 Affordable housing and housing mix**

- 7.4.1 Policy CP5 of the CSDMP concerns the provision of affordable housing, and states that developments of 15 or more units will require 40% on site provision. Paragraphs 173 and 174 of the NPPF state that developments should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. The application is accompanied by a viability assessment which concludes that it would not be economically viable to provide affordable housing across this site. This assessment has been independently assessed by external viability consultants, who have considered the applicant's calculations, and agreed with their conclusions that it would not be economically viable to develop the site if affordable housing contributions were sought. As such, it is considered that no affordable housing contribution should be sought for this proposal. The Council does not have the authority to assess such schemes in conjunction with previously approved planning permissions.

- 7.4.2 Policy CP6 concerns dwelling size and type and states that market housing should comprise 10% 1-bed, 40% 2-bed, 40% 3-bed and 10% 4+-bed units. The proposal is for 16 2-bed units, which other than 3-bed units are the size of units most in demand. While this does not strictly comply with our housing mix policy, it is acknowledged that 2-bedroom units are in demand and as such, in this instance it is not considered to be a reason for refusal.

- 7.4.3 It is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of affordable housing and housing mix.

#### **7.5 Impact on character**

- 7.5.1 Paragraph 56 of the NPPF states that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Paragraph 58 goes on to say that planning decisions should aim to ensure that developments respond to local character and history, reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture. Policy DM9 states that development should respect and enhance the local, natural and historic character of the environment, paying particular regard to scale, materials, massing, bulk and density.

- 7.5.2 The Guiding Principles of the A30 Commercial Corridor Character Area state that contemporary architectural design will be welcomed where it is of high quality, buildings should be a maximum of five storeys, the scale and massing of development should be proportionate to its surroundings, retention of good quality Victorian/Edwardian buildings will be strongly encouraged, and that contemporary flat roofs can be used for buildings with large footprints.

- 7.5.3 The previous development on site consisted of three terraced Victorian cottages (one split into two maisonettes), and while retention of such buildings is generally encouraged, these would have been surrounded by three residential buildings of a much larger scale due to the construction of Blocks A, B & C. While slightly smaller than Blocks A, B & C, this proposal is of a scale and design very close to that of the surrounding residential blocks and its modern appearance and architectural design would be much more in keeping with the new streetscene.

- 7.5.4 Part of the front elevation would be 4m from the road, with the remaining part of the front elevation 5.5m from the road, which is the same as the neighbouring Block B. It is not considered that this setback would cause any significant adverse impacts on the character given the setback and layout of the other Blocks. While Principle YK3 of the Yorktown Landscape Strategy SPD requires that a building of this size would require a 10 metre setback from the road, this does not apply to the west of Frimley Road where the application site is located.
- 7.5.5 While the proposal would result in a high density of dwellings within the immediate vicinity, this is not unusual in such areas close to town centres where several apartment blocks are in close proximity, and maximises the use of the available space in accordance with Policies CP2, CP3 and paragraph 17 of the NPPF as described in paragraph 7.3.1 above. When making density calculations the whole application site is taken into account such that Blocks A, B, C and this proposal together would provide a density of 206 dwellings per hectare approximately. This is not significantly different than the existing situation, taking into account Blocks A, B and C together with the previous dwellings on the site would have resulted in a density of 182 dwellings per hectare. As such, no objections are raised in terms of density.
- 7.5.6 Blocks A, B and C have already been considered appropriate in terms of character under the 2014 appeal decision and this proposal is very similar in terms of design, scale and layout. It is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of character and in accordance with Policy DM9 and the Guiding Principles of the A30 Commercial Corridor Character Area.

## **7.6 Impact on residential amenity**

- 7.6.1 Paragraph 17 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Policy DM9 states that development will be acceptable where it respects the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and uses. It is necessary to take into account matters such as overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light and an overbearing or unneighbourly built form.
- 7.6.2 The proposal would be closest to Block B which is currently unoccupied, with 5.1m approx between the southern side elevation of the proposed building and the northern side elevation of Block B. There are, however, no side windows on this elevation of Block B so the proximity of the new building would not cause any issues in terms of loss of privacy or an overbearing relationship. There are two windows proposed on this side of the apartments in close proximity to Block B, which could suffer some loss of light from Block B, however, the size of these windows is considered to be acceptable to maximise the light available.
- 7.6.3 The proposed building is approximately 10m to the south of Block A and objections were raised in terms of overlooking between the two buildings. Officers raised concern with regard to a large window on the side of the building to serve Bedroom 2, which would have caused mutual overlooking between the proposed building and Block A. The applicant has consequently changed the plans, to provide for a bay window instead on this side, which would only have views towards Frimley Road and the car park behind and none towards Block A itself. While there are still windows facing Block A on the roof apartment, very similar to the roof apartment on Block A itself, these apartments are set back from the main side/rear elevations of the buildings by a further 1.6m and additionally the terrace boundary on both apartments further obscures any direct views of each other. There are balconies to the front of the building but again these do not provide any direct views of Block A.

- 7.6.4 Windows to the rear of the building will face the car park and as such will not have any direct views onto Block A, and some of these will be obscure glazed. Concern has been expressed about loss of privacy on balconies, but by their nature in a location such as this, balconies cannot be considered to be completely private and the proposed building causes no direct overlooking of other balconies. Balconies in Block A are in any case recessed into the building and are approximately 18m to the north-west of the proposed rear windows. The proposed building's rear elevation would be approximately 4.2m behind the rear elevation of Block B and as such no mutual overlooking of balconies would occur.
- 7.6.5 Concern has also been expressed about loss of light to Block A, however the proposed building is 10m away and is only adjacent to approximately 8.5m of the 35m rear elevation of Block A. As such, no significant adverse impacts in terms of loss of light, overshadowing or an overbearing relationship are anticipated.
- 7.6.6 It is considered that any noise resulting from the construction of the development can be controlled and details included in a Construction Management Plan which can be secured by condition.
- 7.6.7 The proposed building does not provide for any amenity space around the building, however, there is some shared amenity space that will be provided as part of the development of Blocks A, B & C under the 2014 appeal decision. It is accepted that there is no space in this location to provide any further amenity space and in this respect it is necessary to take into the account the 2014 appeal decision where the Inspector did not regard the lack of amenity space as a barrier to the proposals, stating that the amount did not contravene any specific policies within the CSDMP. Concern has also been raised about proposed amenity space for the basement apartments and while they do not have balconies, there is an area of proposed hardstanding to the front of the building where there would be three sets of patio doors per apartment which would open onto this area. As such, no objections are raised on these grounds.
- 7.6.8 It is therefore considered that the revised proposals are now acceptable in terms of residential amenity and will not cause any harm in terms of overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light or an overbearing relationship, and accordingly the proposal is in accordance with Policy DM9 and the NPPF in this regard.

## **7.7 Highways, Access and Parking**

- 7.7.1 Paragraph 32 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should take account of whether safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people, and that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. Policy DM11 states that development which would adversely impact the safe and efficient flow of traffic movement on the highway network will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that measures to reduce such impacts to acceptable levels can be implemented.
- 7.7.2 A Transport Statement was submitted with the application which shows that the traffic generation for the additional 16 dwellings is likely to result in 5 two way movements in the morning peak hour of 8-9am, and 6 in the evening hours of 5-6pm, although movements from the previous dwellings have not been deducted. The proposed dwellings are likely to increase the traffic generated from the four blocks together by approximately 19% in the morning and 21% in the evening. The Transport Statement concludes that this increase cannot be considered severe in the context of paragraph 32 of the NPPF. The small increase in cars generated by the development is not considered to adversely affect pedestrian or highway safety at the junction with the A30.

There is no requirement for the applicant to undertake an assessment of public transport capacity and no reason to think there are any capacity issues.

- 7.7.3 There would be 16 parking spaces provided for the apartments, which is one space per apartment and this amount is in line with the recommendations in Surrey County Council Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance 2012. These spaces would be located on the lower floor underneath the existing parking area for Block A and accessed at the rear of the building via Sullivan Road, along the access already permitted for Block B & C parking areas. Cycle parking would also be provided adjacent to the basement flats. Pedestrian access would be from the rear of the building and could be accessed from Frimley Road by walking down the side of the building to the north, between Blocks B & C or from Sullivan Road to the rear.
- 7.7.4 The County Highway Authority have been consulted on the application and have taken into account the likely net additional traffic generation, access arrangements and parking provision and are satisfied that the proposal would not have a material impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining public highway. They have not objected, subject to a condition for a construction management plan. It is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of highways, parking and access and in line with Policy DM11 and the NPPF in this regard.

## **7.8 Trees, landscaping and ecology**

- 7.8.1 Paragraph 109 of the NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and minimising the impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible. Policy DM9 states that development will be acceptable where it protects trees and other vegetation worthy of retention.
- 7.8.2 At present there are no trees or landscaping on the site. The landscaping plan that was already consented for the existing Blocks A, B & C would have to be amended to allow for this development. The strip of land to the north of Block B would be reduced in width and the location of the trees around the car park of Block A would be slightly amended. The reduction in width of this strip is not considered to have a significant adverse impact on landscaping and it is considered that further vegetation can be provided as part of this development around the edges of the site and car parking area.
- 7.8.3 The Council's Arboricultural Officer has been consulted and has no objection to the proposals, subject to a condition requiring a comprehensive landscaping scheme to provide trees, shrubs, understorey/ground cover for the development, with details of plant species, management and maintenance.
- 7.8.4 Policy CP14A of the CSDMP states that the Council will seek to conserve and enhance biodiversity within Surrey Heath and that new development will where appropriate, be required to contribute to the protection, management and enhancement of biodiversity.
- 7.8.5 In terms of ecology, the site has limited ecological value being comprised of mostly hardstanding. An Ecological Assessment has been submitted which states that no evidence of any protected species were found on site, however because there is woodland habitat in close proximity on the other side of the A30, bird boxes could be provided to provide gains in biodiversity. The Surrey Wildlife Trust has been consulted and states that there are opportunities to enhance biodiversity on the site. This can be dealt with by planning condition.
- 7.8.7 It is therefore considered that subject to conditions the proposal is acceptable in terms of trees, landscaping and ecology.



## **7.9 Impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area**

- 7.9.1 All of Surrey Heath lies within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and this site is approximately 1.2km from the SPA. The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy SPD was adopted in 2012 to mitigate effects of new residential development on the SPA. It states that no new residential development is permitted within 400m of the SPA. All new development is required to either provide Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) on site (for larger proposals) or for smaller proposals such as this one, provided that sufficient SANG is available and can be allocated to the development, a financial contribution towards SANG provided, which is now collected as part of CIL. This development would be CIL liable, so a contribution would be payable on commencement of development.
- 7.9.2 The development would also be liable for a contribution towards SAMM (Strategic Access Monitoring and Maintenance) of the SANG, which is a payment separate from CIL and would depend on the sizes of the units proposed. This proposal is liable for a SAMM payment of £5839 which takes into account the existing floorspace.
- 7.9.3 It is therefore considered that, subject to the payment of SAMM or a satisfactory legal obligation to secure a SAMM contribution, the proposal complies with Policy CP14B and Policy NRM6, and the Thames Basin Heaths SPD. Informatives relating to CIL would also be imposed.

## **7.10 Other matters**

- 7.10.1 As explained above, this development would be CIL liable, and CIL would be payable on commencement. It is therefore considered that the proposal would be in accordance with Policy CP12, the Infrastructure Delivery SPD and the NPPF in this regard.
- 7.10.2 The application site is located within Flood Zone 1 and is less than 1 ha in size, and as such no Flood Risk Assessment was required. The applicant has submitted a SuDs Drainage Strategy and as this is a major development comments are awaited from the Local Lead Flood Authority. These will be reported at meeting.
- 7.10.3 The development would be designed to be energy efficient and take into account renewable sources of energy with photovoltaic panels proposed on the roof. In line with Policy CP2 and the NPPF the development would therefore assist in minimising energy consumption.

## **8.0 ARTICLE 2(3) DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT)**

**ORDER 20**

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 suggested/accepted/negotiated 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.

## 9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 It is considered that the proposal is acceptable in all regards subject to the necessary conditions. It is therefore considered that, subject to comments from outstanding consultees, and subject to the receipt of SAMM or a satisfactory legal agreement to secure the provision of SAMM before the due date, the proposal is acceptable and permission can be granted.

## 10.0 RECOMMENDATION

GRANT 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:
  - Apartment Block D Floor Plans Drawing number FSW 12-1003-P2-160 Revision B date 11.08.15
  - Apartment Block D Elevations Drawing number FSW 12-1003-P2-170 Revision A date 11.08.15
  - Parking Layout Drawing number FSW 12-1003-P2-27
  - Proposed Site Sections Drawing number FSW 12-1003-P2-25 Revision A date 29.05.13
  - Proposed Site Plans Drawing number FSW 12-1003-P2-24 Revision A date 30.04.15

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.

3. No development shall take place until a Construction 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) provision of boundary hoarding behind any visibility zones
  - e) hours of working and any measures used to reduce construction noise

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

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users or impact on local amenity to accord with Policy DM9 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012.

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. The parking spaces and cycle spaces shown on the submitted plans shall be made available for use before the first occupation of the development hereby permitted and shall be kept available for their intended purpose during the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users or impact on local amenity to accord with Policy DM9 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012.

6. Within three months from the date of decision a Landscape and Ecology Plan shall be provided which shall include the following details:
  1. Full details of both hard and soft landscaping works. 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.
  2. Details of the ecological enhancements to be provided (i.e. bird nesting opportunities and the use of native plant species of local provenance)

All hard and soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and fully implemented prior to first occupation. Any plants which within 5 years of the development being substantially complete die; become damaged, diseased or are removed shall be replaced in kind.

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.

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.

### Informative(s)

1. CIL Liable CIL1
2. Building Regs consent req'd DF5
3. Decision Notice to be kept DS1
4. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to obstruct the public highway by the erection of scaffolding, hoarding or any other device or apparatus for which a licence must be sought from the Highway Authority Local Highways Service.
5. 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 1990, Sections 131,148,149).
6. There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. In order to protect public sewers and ensure that Thames Water can gain access to those sewers for future repair and maintenance, approval should be sought from Thames Water. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0800 009 3921 to discuss options available at this site.
7. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water will be required to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

**In the event that a satisfactory legal agreement has not been received by the 18 September 2015 in relation to SAMM, or, in the alternative, the required contribution been paid, the Executive Head of Regulatory be authorised to REFUSE the application for the following reasons:-**

1. In the absence of a completed legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, or payment of the SAMM payment in advance of the determination of the application, 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).