

## Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 16 September 2015

Site visit made on 16 September 2015

**by Michael Boniface MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 17 December 2015**

**Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/W/15/3028247**

**Land south of 24-46 Kings Road and 6 & 9 Rose Meadow, West End, Woking, Surrey**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by William Lacey Group Ltd against Surrey Heath Borough Council.
- The application Ref SU/14/0532, is dated 5 June 2014.
- The development proposed is the erection of 84 residential homes, including 34 affordable homes, with associated access.

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 84 residential homes, including 34 affordable homes, with associated access at Land south of 24-46 Kings Road and 6 & 9 Rose Meadow, West End, Woking, Surrey in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref SU/14/0532, dated 5 June 2014, subject to the conditions contained in the attached Schedule.

### Preliminary Matters

2. No formal decision was issued by the Council in this case but it has since confirmed that it would have refused planning permission for the following reason: *The proposal by reason of being sited within the Countryside beyond the Green Belt, in the eastern part of the Borough, would result in the release of land for development that would currently conflict with the spatial strategy for the Borough, which seeks to firstly concentrate development in the western part of the borough and settlement areas on previously developed land. At this current time, the release of this land would therefore be harmful to the intrinsic characteristics of the countryside and in the absence of review, evidence and phasing to justify its release would conflict with Policies CP1 and CP3(iii) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.* I have taken this to be the decision that the Council would have made, had it been empowered to do so.
3. The application is submitted in outline form with access to be considered. Matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are reserved for subsequent consideration. I have considered the appeal on this basis.
4. During the Hearing, the main parties agreed that the submitted location plan, drawing number P941/02, had been superseded and that the Council had considered a later iteration, P941/02 Rev B. The revised drawing extends the

application boundary to the public highway. As this was the plan considered and consulted upon by the Council, no party is prejudiced by its submission in respect of this appeal and I have taken it into account in reaching my decision.

5. During the course of considering the planning application, the Council altered the description of development to include the proposed mix of house types. The Appellant suggests that this matter is yet to be firmly established and is for consideration at the reserved matters stage. In light of this, I have used the original description of development contained in the planning application.

### **Main Issues**

6. The main issues are whether the proposal would accord with the spatial strategy for the area, as well as local and national planning policy; the effect on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA), and the effect on the intrinsic character of the countryside.

### **Reasons**

#### *Spatial strategy*

7. Policy H8 of the Surrey Heath Local Plan (LP) (2000) identifies the appeal site as a Reserve Housing Site, land which is reserved to meet possible long-term development needs and is consequently excluded from the Green Belt. This policy remains saved, notwithstanding the Council's subsequent adoption of the Core Strategy & Development Management Policies 2011-2028 (CS&DMP) (2012).
8. Policy CP1 of the CS&DMP sets out the spatial strategy for the Borough which envisages that new development will come forward largely through redevelopment of previously developed land in the western part of the Borough. West End is identified as a 'smaller village' which is said to have limited capacity to accommodate any new development. It does not, however, preclude development. Development in the Countryside beyond the Green Belt (such as the appeal site) will not be permitted where it results in the coalescence of settlements. However, the Council accept that this would not be the case in respect of the appeal proposal. Noting the large area of intervening green space that would remain beyond the appeal site and the built up area of the closest settlement, Bisley, I have no reason to disagree.
9. Policy CP3 of the CS&DMP sets out the scale and distribution of new housing within the Borough during the plan period and outlines that provision will be made for 3240 (net) additional dwellings. This figure derives from the housing requirements formerly contained within the, now largely revoked, South East Plan (2009) and based upon a Strategic Housing Market Assessment at that time. That said, it was acknowledged that the housing need for the area would not be met by this level of provision. The Inspector's report<sup>1</sup> following examination of the CS&DMP, having regard to the proposed phasing supporting the policy, is clear that a five year housing land supply would not be provided and this was clearly at odds with national policy at that time<sup>2</sup>. Nevertheless, the difficulties in providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) so as to avoid significant effects on the SPA were seen as a local constraint that justified a departure from national policy.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 26

<sup>2</sup> Planning Policy Statement 3 - Housing

10. Shortly after the CS&DMP was adopted, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. Whilst the more recent publication of national policy does not automatically lead to an adopted development plan being out of date, paragraph 215 states that due weight should be given to policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the Framework. Whilst the Framework cannot alter the statutory basis under which the development plan applies<sup>3</sup>, it is an important material consideration.
11. Paragraph 47 introduced a key objective to boost significantly the supply of housing. In order to achieve this, Local Planning Authorities are required to ensure that Local Plans meet the full, objectively assessed needs (FOAN) for market and affordable housing, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the Framework. Consideration of this matter is also a requirement in decision making, as is highlighted by the Hunston<sup>4</sup> Judgement.
12. To my mind, this introduces a much greater emphasis on the delivery of housing than was the case at the time of adopting the CS&DMP, albeit that this must be weighed against other policies of the Framework. Given that the CS&DMP, even at the time of adoption, would not meet housing requirements for the plan period, this represents a clear conflict with the Framework. Furthermore, Policy CP3 outlines a strategy to reserve housing sites until after 2025 and only release them if it is established at that time that insufficient sites have come forward. This is likely to result in significant delay in addressing potential housing shortfalls that would be at odds with the Framework's important objective to boost significantly the supply of housing. For these reasons, I attach the policies of the Framework in respect of housing great weight and this justifies a departure from the development plan.
13. Furthermore, paragraph 47 makes it a requirement to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing (including a 5%/20% buffer) against housing needs. The Council argue that its housing requirement is that contained within the CS&DMP but it accepts that its latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2014) represents the most up to date FOAN figure for the area. As this is a recent assessment for the Housing Market Area that takes account of migration, travel to work patterns and recent DCLG household projections, this seems to me to represent a more robust basis for considering current housing requirements than the now out of date figures within the CS&DMP.
14. Whilst I have had regard to the letter from Brandon Lewis MP to the Planning Inspectorate in December 2014, which outlined that SHMA's are untested and should not automatically be seen as a proxy for a final housing requirement, I am satisfied, based on the evidence before me, that this is the correct approach in this case.
15. There was some divergence in the housing land supply claimed by the Council and that suggested by the appellant but a range of scenarios was submitted during the Hearing. The most optimistic of those using the SHMA housing requirement (340 dwellings per annum), suggests a housing land supply of 5.1 years. This is based on the inclusion of a 5% buffer and the supply figure identified in the Council's 5 Year Housing Land Supply 2015-2020 (February

---

<sup>3</sup> S38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

<sup>4</sup> Hunston Properties Limited v. (1) Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and (2) St Albans City and District Council [2013] EWHC 2678 (Admin)

2015) report, after deducting 17 units which the Council conceded were unlikely to be delivered (1884 dwellings). This also takes account of the reduced backlog figure presented by the Council during the Hearing which was amended from 156 dwellings to 54 dwellings based on its recorded completions between 1 April 2014 and 31 March 2015.

16. However, the appellant raised a number of concerns about the figures feeding into this calculation. Principally, suggesting that a 20% buffer should be applied. Having regard to the completion data compared to the development plan requirements contained in paragraph 4.1.40 of the appellant's Statement of Clarification, there has been an under delivery for 5 out of the 9 past years (the latest completion figures provided by the Council now show a surplus for 2014/15). However, 3 of these years immediately preceded adoption of the CS&DMP at a time when there were acknowledged constraints to development posed by the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. Subsequently, there has been no pattern of under delivery or any significant shortfall in provision overall. In the absence of any persistent under delivery, indeed many of the years have provided a surplus, I conclude that the 5% buffer is appropriate.
17. There is also dispute between the parties as to whether a number of the sites included in the Council's supply figures were in fact deliverable in the terms of paragraph 47 of the Framework and, whilst the Planning Practice Guidance makes it clear that S78 appeals are not the place for local plan style examinations of housing sites, some were discussed during the Hearing in order to establish the latest position.
18. Of importance is the site known as Princess Royal Barracks which the Council expect to deliver 500 units by 2020. This would be at a rate of 125 dwellings per year for the latter 4 years of the period. The appellant suggests that a more likely build out rate based on comparable schemes is in the region of 50-100 dwellings per year. I am inclined to agree that 125 dwellings per year seems overly optimistic and I was provided no detailed evidence from the Council to suggest that such a rate of delivery could be expected, notwithstanding that officers may have had undisclosed discussions with the developer.
19. Furthermore, the Council confirmed that planning permission and subsequent reserved matters approval only provided for 81 dwellings to be built at the present time, the remaining number all requiring further approvals before development could commence. This may further delay the rate of delivery, noting that full permission does not exist even for the first year's expected delivery.
20. Conversely, the appellant's expectation that the site will deliver just 200 dwellings is at the lower end of the expected build out rate. In reality, the delivery is likely to be somewhere in between the parties' estimates. However, even based on the appellant's upper range for build out at 100 dwellings per year, this would reduce delivery by 100 units within the five year period. This would have the effect of reducing the demonstrable five year housing land supply to 4.85 years. This is assuming that all other sites identified by the Council would deliver in line with its expectations but there are numerous other sites that the appellant takes issue with. However, I need not explore these further for the purposes of this appeal as the result could only worsen the housing land supply position.



21. I conclude that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five year housing land supply in accordance with paragraph 47. Under these circumstances, paragraph 49 of the Framework advises that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be seen as up-to-date. This would include Policy CP3 of the CS&DMP. Where this is the case, housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
22. Paragraph 14 of the Framework states that, for decision taking this means granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole, or specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted. This is the basis on which I must determine the appeal.

*Thames Basin Heaths SPA*

23. The site is around 0.8km from the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA). The Habitats Regulations<sup>5</sup> require that proposed developments do not adversely impact on the integrity of the SPA, which in this case seeks to protect a number of internationally important bird populations and habitats. Significant effects should be avoided and new residential development should not be allowed within 5km of the SPA unless measures are in place to avoid or mitigate such impacts which may arise either alone or in combination with other development.
24. Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan (SEP) (2009) sets these requirements out in policy terms and outlines a strategy for facilitating new development, whilst avoiding potential impacts, including through the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS). Locally, these requirements are recognised through Policy CP14 of the CS&DMP and the Council's Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (2012).
25. This sets out a strategy to avoid any significant effects, including in combination effects, arising from residential development through the collection of financial contributions towards the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).
26. The SANGS are areas of open space close to the proposed development designed for recreational use by future occupants which it is expected will be used in lieu of land within the SPA, thus negating the potential for damage or other adverse effects to its integrity. To ensure that this strategy is successful, the SAMM contribution is used to employ wardens to patrol the SPA, for educating the public about the SPA and to monitor the ongoing effectiveness of the approach. Both parties agree that these measures are necessary to avoid significant adverse effects on the SPA and that they would be effective in avoiding harm. The approach accords with the Council's policies and its published Avoidance Strategy and I am minded to agree.
27. Concerns were raised by the Council regarding the availability of SANGS land in the area that might be able to serve the development but the Statement of Common Ground outlines various options that are likely to come forward in the foreseeable future, including at Heather Farm and Bisley Common. No specific

---

<sup>5</sup> Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2012 (as amended)

SANGS was formally identified for the appeal proposal at the present time but it was also agreed that a Grampian style condition could be used to prevent any development until such time as suitable SANGS was in place. In essence, this would prevent any development and any potential impacts until the necessary avoidance measures were secured. This is an approach endorsed by Natural England in its consultation response dated 27 July 2015.

28. It was highlighted that the Council's CIL tariff makes provision for the collection of SANGS contributions where the relevant SANGS would be within the Local Authority Area. Subsequently, a Unilateral Undertaking has also been provided to secure the necessary SANGS payment, notwithstanding the Council's view that this could be secured at the Reserved Matters stage. These measures would accord with the Council's Avoidance Strategy and ensure that significant effects to the SPA were avoided.
29. Whilst it is often undesirable to grant planning permission which cannot be implemented until the terms of a Grampian condition can be fulfilled and where this relies upon parties other than the appellant, I am persuaded that there is a good prospect of suitable SANGS land becoming available within the time span of any planning permission granted, and this seems to me to be a reasonable approach in this case.
30. I have had regard to advice in Planning Practice Guidance that such conditions should generally only be used for development of strategic importance but I cannot conclude that the development would avoid harm to the SPA in the absence of the condition. Given the clear indication that the matter can be dealt with within the lifetime of the planning permission, I consider that it is reasonable to rely on the approach in this case in order to ensure that much needed housing is delivered. The condition will prevent any development coming forwards until SANGS are available and there is, therefore, no risk to the SPA.
31. It was suggested by the Council that an Appropriate Assessment (AA) would be necessary under the Habitats Regulations, but this is only required where significant effects are likely to result to the SPA. I have established that significant effects on the SPA would be avoided in this instance and, therefore, AA is not required. Consequently, paragraph 119 of the Framework does not preclude application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
32. I conclude that significant effects on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA would be avoided and I find no conflict with Policy NRM6 of the SEP; Policy CP14 of the CS&DMP; or the Council's Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (2012).

*Character of the countryside*

33. The site is located on the edge of the village, to the rear of properties on Kings Road and Rose Meadow. The remaining boundaries are surrounded by established tree and hedgerow planting providing a good level of screening and visual containment. Whilst the development would be visible from a number of residential properties surrounding the site, wider views from the surrounding countryside would be limited.
34. The Council concludes that if there is a clear proven need to release countryside for housing, the impacts on character grounds would be

acceptable. The development would alter the appearance of the currently undeveloped site to that of a developed site, resulting in loss of its intrinsic countryside character. However, I have already concluded that the Council is unable to demonstrate sufficient land availability to deliver much needed housing in line with the Framework's objectives.

35. Given my observations above and the Council's own conclusion regarding the impact of the development, this need for housing outweighs the loss of intrinsic character in this instance. This is particularly so, as it appears unlikely that the Council can deliver sufficient housing to meet the identified need for the area without using land in the countryside. The fact that this site is specifically identified for future development and purposefully removed from the Green Belt further indicates that the site is suitable for residential development.
36. Consequently, I have no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusion that the appeal proposal accords with Policy DM9 of the CS&DMP which seeks to protect the character of the countryside.

### **Other Matters**

37. A number of interested parties raised concerns regarding highway and transport impacts, including highway safety. The application is accompanied by a detailed Transport Assessment (TA) (June 2014) which considers the capacity of the local highway network to accommodate the proposed development, taking account of the private roads, Rose Meadow and Kings Road. This was carried out in consultation with Surrey County Council, the Local Highway Authority, and concludes that little impact would result in terms of highway safety or capacity. Having considered the document, the County Council raises no objection.
38. The TA identifies that in combination with other development in the area, future delays might be experienced on the A322 but the County Council is satisfied that suitable improvement works would increase capacity and improve operation of the nearby roundabout. However, it is accepted that these improvements are not necessary to make the appeal proposal acceptable in planning terms. Notwithstanding this, the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Tariff would provide potential funding for any necessary future improvements.
39. A suitable hard surface is in place to serve the site from Beldam Bridge Road, Kings Road and Rose Meadow. Whilst the surface on the remainder of Kings Road is in a poor state of repair, the TA confirms that the development is unlikely to generate significant amounts of traffic from this direction.
40. Overall, the Council conclude that the appeal proposal is acceptable in highway terms and in accordance with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the CS&DMP. I have no reason to disagree based on the evidence before me.
41. The Ecological Appraisal (June 2014) and Reptile Survey (May 2014) accompanying the application identify limited ecological potential on the site, largely due to the annual harvesting of hay. Whilst I have had regard to the submissions of local people, who suggest that wildlife is often apparent on the site, the submitted reports conclude that limited impact is likely to result in biodiversity terms subject to a range of mitigation and enhancement measures. Such measures would be secured by condition in the event that planning

permission is granted and would ensure compliance with Policy CP14 of the CS&DMP.

42. A number of concerns were raised regarding contamination, drainage and flood risk on the site. The majority of the site is located within flood zone 1 (lowest risk) as identified by the Environment Agency and no built development is proposed in the higher risk flood areas, notwithstanding the indicative nature of the site layout drawings at the present time. The Drainage Impact Assessment (June 2014) confirms that suitable foul and surface water drainage can be provided to serve the development and avoid flooding on site or elsewhere. Although further details will be required at the reserved matter stage, the Council confirm that the development would accord with policy DM10 of the CS&DMP. I have seen no evidence to contradict the detailed assessment submitted and have no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusions in these regards. It was suggested by an interested party that the development should finance the provision of mains sewerage in the vicinity of the site but this would not be reasonable or necessary as a result of the development and would not meet the relevant tests for planning obligations or conditions.
43. The impact of the development on local infrastructure is also a key concern for local people. In this respect, I have had regard to the CIL Charging Schedule adopted by the Council and which is now in effect. The development would be liable for a payment under this scheme. The schedule includes payments towards SANGS, open space, transport projects, play areas and equipment, indoor sports, community facilities such as libraries and surgeries, waste and recycling, and flood defence/drainage improvements. The purpose of the CIL is to ensure sufficient funding in the area for necessary improvement as a result of development, including cumulative impacts. I am satisfied that such a payment would ensure that the impacts of the development were sufficiently mitigated where necessary.
44. One absence from the scheme is any payment towards education provision. In these regards, I note the submission of many local people, both in writing and during the Hearing that the local school is at capacity. Although the County Council has requested a contribution towards local education provision, the Council consider that this has not been justified with reference to the tests for planning obligations set out at paragraph 204 of the Framework, and these tests are further set out in law<sup>6</sup>.
45. The County Council is seeking contributions towards generic local improvements to local schools, including Bisley Primary School and Bishop David Brown Secondary School. However, despite assertions that local schools are at or nearing capacity, no evidence has been provided as to the remaining capacity, notably in relation to Holy Trinity Primary School in West End itself or in relation to secondary schools. It is also suggested that improvement/expansion works are already underway to deal with increased demand and it is unclear whether these works would provide the capacity needed as a result of this development. Therefore, I am inclined to agree with the Council that the requested contributions have not been justified as being necessary as a result of the appeal proposal. Whilst the submitted Unilateral Undertaking makes provision for an education contribution if I were to

---

<sup>6</sup> Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010



determine it necessary, I am unable to take it into account for the reasons set out above.

46. Neighbours to the site have raised concern regarding impacts to their living conditions arising from the development. Matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are reserved matters at this stage and potential impacts would need to be fully considered at the reserved matters stage. However, the indicative drawings submitted demonstrate that 84 dwellings could be accommodated without unacceptable harm to living conditions. A good level of separation would be maintained between existing and proposed properties and the residential nature of the development would be compatible with surrounding land uses. Although the currently open views valued by local people would be interrupted, private views are not protected under the planning system and this would not materially harm living conditions.
47. The matter of Human Rights has been raised by a nearby resident, suggesting that the development would affect residents' ability to enjoy the current peace, tranquillity and rural aspect of the area. Submissions were made relating to Article 8 of the European Convention of Human Rights and I recognise that if the appeal is allowed it would interfere with Mr and Mrs Jones' home and family life. This consideration must be balanced against the rights and freedoms of others, however, and I am satisfied that if this development goes ahead its effects on Mr and Mrs Jones would not be disproportionate. For the same reason, I consider the interference with Mr and Mrs Jones' peaceful enjoyment of their property is proportionate and strikes a fair balance in compliance with the requirements of Article 1 of the First Protocol.
48. The Council raises no concerns with regard to archaeology which it suggests can be dealt with by condition; the amount of affordable housing proposed (40%) which accords with Policy CP5 of the CS&DMP; crime, subject to an appropriate layout as reserved matters stage; the ability to provide sufficient open space, which is indicated on the indicative drawings; or in respect of any other matters. Based on the evidence before me, I have no reason to reach a different conclusion on these matters.
49. I note that there is significant local objection to the proposed development, which was highlighted in the significant amount of written submissions, attendance at the Hearing and through representations from the local Member of Parliament. I have had regard to the perceived impact on the local community but growth is clearly necessary and I see no reason why the proposed development could not be satisfactorily integrated with the existing community. Whilst I have taken all of these matters into account I must determine the appeal in line with current planning policy.

### **Planning Obligations**

50. A draft Unilateral Undertaking was provided in advance of the Hearing but a completed version was not available. This has subsequently been provided, having been amended to adjust its wording and technical construction in line with discussions at the Hearing. The proposed obligations, involving a SAMM and education contribution, along with affordable housing provision remain.
51. I have already established that the education contribution is not justified in light of the tests set out in CIL Regulation 122. No need for the contribution has been established and I cannot take it into account.

52. Conversely, I have established that the SAMM contribution is necessary to avoid significant effects on the SPA in accordance with the development plan and the Habitats Regulations. Furthermore, I am satisfied that the proposed affordable housing provision is necessary and in accordance with Policy CP5 of the CS&DMP. These contributions accord with the requirements of the CIL Regulations and have been taken into account.

### **Conclusion**

53. The development would deliver much needed housing, including affordable housing, and this weighs significantly in favour of the proposal, along with other benefits such as the creation of jobs during construction and support for local services from increased population. I have found no harm in economic, social or environmental terms that is sufficient to significantly and demonstrably outweigh these benefits and having regard to paragraphs 18 to 219 of the Framework taken as a whole, I conclude that the proposal represents sustainable development to which the presumption in favour applies.

54. In light of the above, and having taking all other matters into account, planning permission should be granted.

### **Conditions**

55. The main parties have agreed a number of conditions that would be necessary in the event that planning permission is granted. I have attached the standard conditions for further approvals and time restrictions relevant to outline applications.

56. I have found it necessary to require accordance with the recommendations of the relevant ecological assessments to protect and enhance biodiversity affected by the development. Furthermore, as discussed in the decision, a Grampian style condition is necessary to ensure that development cannot commence without the necessary SANGS provision to avoid significant effects on the SPA.

57. A contamination investigation is needed given the past use of the site and the sensitive residential use proposed. A Method of Construction Statement is necessary to minimise the impacts on neighbouring residents and ensure highway safety during construction. It is also reasonable to require details of the proposed road surface materials to ensure suitability for the development.

58. I have not found it necessary to attach a condition relating to landscaping as this remains a reserved matter that is not for consideration as part of this application. I am not satisfied of its need to make the development acceptable at the current stage.

59. Details of the finished levels of the proposed buildings and roads are necessary to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development and in the interests of neighbours' living conditions. Drainage details are required to ensure an appropriate form of development. The location of refuse and cycle stores should be identified. There is a need for details of any external lighting to protect neighbours' living conditions and avoid harm to ecology. Finally, a Travel Plan is necessary to promote sustainable patterns of development.

60. I have altered the wording of the proposed conditions to improve their precision and otherwise ensure compliance with Planning Practice Guidance.

*Michael Boniface*

INSPECTOR