

2016/0678

Reg Date 22/08/2016

Bagshot

LOCATION: BOVINGDON COTTAGE, AND CATTERY, BRACKNELL ROAD, BAGSHOT, GU19 5HX

PROPOSAL: Erection of 2 x 3 bedroom and 1 x 2 bedroom dwellings with attached garages, following demolition of existing bungalow and cattery/kennel buildings. (Amended Plan - Rec'd 20/10/2016 & 21/10/16).
(Amended Plans + Additional Plan - Rec'd 24/10/2016.)
(Amended & additional plans recv'd 25/10/16)

TYPE: Full Planning Application

APPLICANT: Mr Richard Waple
Lovelace Homes Ltd

OFFICER: Emma Pearman

This application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however it is being reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr White.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT, subject to conditions.

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This application seeks redevelopment of an existing site comprising a residential dwelling and garage, and cattery buildings. The cattery has not been in use for a number of years and is in a dilapidated state. The site is located on the western side of the A322 Bracknell Road in Bagshot, with access directly from the A322. The site falls outside the settlement area of Bagshot and lies wholly within the Green Belt.
- 1.2 The amended proposal would provide two 3-bedroom dwellings and one 2-bedroom dwelling, which are of a size that is in need in Surrey Heath, on a site that has been previously developed. (The original proposal was for 3 x 3-bedroom dwellings with a flat roofed design). The development is considered appropriate in Green Belt terms as the replacement dwelling would not be materially larger than existing, and the redevelopment of the cattery to provide two further dwellings would not have a greater impact on openness than existing. The dwellings have a modern appearance with shallow-pitched roofs however there is no prevailing design in this area and visibility from the main road would be limited. It is considered that the application is acceptable in other regards, subject to comments in terms of the impact on ecology and contaminated land; and subject to receiving the appropriate payments or legal agreement in respect of SAMM and SANG prior to Committee. It is considered planning permission should be granted.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site is a 0.44ha area of land located on the western side of the A322 Bracknell Road, outside the settlement area of Bagshot and within the Green Belt. The application site comprises a single storey dwelling and garage which is still occupied, and a former cattery (disused since 2010) which features a number of small outbuildings to the south and rear of the dwelling. The site is accessed directly from the A322 and has a driveway area to the front with space for several cars, and the front is bordered by a wall. To the rear there is a large garden which was associated with the dwelling rather than cattery, which is currently in an overgrown state.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 90/0214 – Erection of 15 ‘kennel’ units for cats.
Granted 24/05/1990
- 3.2 14/1127 – Kennels, 79 Guildford Road, Bagshot – Demolition of boarding kennels and erection of six 3-bed dwelling houses.
Granted 10/03/2015

4.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 This proposal is for the erection of 2 x 3-bedroom dwellings and 1 x 2-bedroom dwelling with detached garages, following demolition of existing bungalow and cattery/kennel buildings. There would be a replacement dwelling and garage on the site of the existing residential dwelling and garage (Plot 1) and there would be two dwellings on the site of the cattery buildings, one to the front (Plot 3 – the two-bedroom dwelling) and one to the rear (Plot 2). The dwellings would be accessed via the existing access off Bracknell Road, with each dwelling having a garage and additional parking for up to 4 cars. Plots 1 and 2 would have a large rear garden behind the houses, with Plot 3 having a smaller garden to the eastern side.
- Plot 1 would have a shallow pitched roof with maximum height of 5.9m, maximum width of 17.6m and maximum depth of 10.3m. There would be a glazed link to the garage which would have a pitched roof and measure 5.4m in width by 7.1m in depth with a roof height of 3.9m.
 - Plot 2 would have a total width of 16.2m and depth of 9.7m with a maximum height of 4.8m and its garage would have a maximum height of 3.4m, depth of 6.2m and width of 3.5m.
 - Plot 3 (the 2-bedroom dwelling) would have a total width of 13m, depth of 10.1m and height of 4.9m with a shallow pitched roof and a small flat roofed element to the front. Its garage would have a maximum height of 3.4m, depth of 6.2m and width of 3.5m.

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

5.1	Surrey County Highway Authority	No objection, subject to condition.
5.2	Environmental Health Officer	Comments awaited.
5.3	Environment Agency	Comments awaited.
5.4	SCC Archaeology	No objection, subject to condition.
5.5	Council's Arboricultural Officer	No objection, subject to conditions.
5.6	Surrey Wildlife Trust	Comments awaited.
5.7	Windlesham Parish Council	Objection – overdevelopment of the site, not in keeping with local area, site may be in Green Belt.

6.0 REPRESENTATION

6.1 At the time of preparation of this report two letters of objection has been received which raises the following issues:

- Bracknell Road is a dangerous road and would be an increase in traffic *[Officer comment: compared to the former cattery use this is not an increase in traffic – see section 7.6]*
- This is Green Belt and neighbour's applications have been refused on this basis *[see section 7.3]*
- Flat-roofed design of the dwellings is unattractive and should this override concerns about volume increase? *[Officer comment: This letter appears to be in response to the first round of consultation on the previous drawings and the design has since been amended to feature shallow pitched roofs].*

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATION

7.1 The application proposed is considered against the policies within the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 (CSDMP), and in this case the relevant policies are Policy CPA, CP2, CP5, CP6, CP8, CP12, CP14, DM9, DM11, DM13 and Policy DM17. It will also be considered against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

7.2 The main issues to be considered are:

- Principle of the loss of the cattery;
- Principle of the development in the Green Belt;
- Character;

- Residential amenity;
- Highways, parking and access;
- Trees;
- Housing mix and affordable housing;
- Impact on infrastructure;
- Impact on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA; and
- Other matters – ecology, contaminated land, archaeology.

7.3 Principle of the use

7.3.1 At the heart of the NPPF is a requirement to deliver a wide choice of quality homes, and to boost significantly the supply of housing. Surrey Heath does not currently have a 5-year housing land supply. Policy CPA directs new development to the redevelopment of previously developed land. This proposal accords with the NPPF in that it would provide two additional dwellings and additionally the site constitutes previously developed land.

7.3.2 Policy CP8 seeks to make provision for new jobs and utilising existing employment areas, and Policy DM13 resists the loss of employment sites unless it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a need for such units. In this case the cattery falls within sui generis use (not Class B which the policies refer to) and was run by the occupier of the dwelling and his late wife, however it has not been in use since 2010. As such no objection is raised in this regard to the principle of the redevelopment of the site.

7.4 Impact on the Green Belt

7.4.1 Paragraph 79 of the NPPF states that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts, and that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts being their openness and their permanence.

7.4.2 Paragraph 87 states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 88 states that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 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.

7.4.3 Paragraph 89 states that local planning authorities should regard the construction

of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt, but lists some exceptions; two of which are relevant to this application. Firstly, the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces; and secondly the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land) 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.

- 7.4.4 In this case, the replacement of the house and garage with another house and garage, can be considered to be the replacement of a buildings in the same use, and as such this is not considered inappropriate in the Green Belt if the buildings are not materially larger. The existing footprint of the house is 136m² and the proposed footprint of Plot 1 on the same area is 169m² which is an increase of 24%. The existing volume of the house is 571m³ and the proposed volume is 640m³ which is an increase of 12%. As such this is not considered to be materially larger than existing. While there would be a mezzanine floor inserted, which would see the floorspace increase within the region of 52%, this is within the fabric of the building, not visible externally, and within the overall footprint and volume increase which is considered acceptable. The bulk and massing of the development, as indicated by the volume calculations, is not considered to appear significantly larger than existing.
- 7.4.5 The existing area of the garage is 41m² and proposed for Plot 1 is 28m², which is a reduction of 46%. The existing volume is 90m³ and proposed is 85m³ and this is a reduction of 5%. As such the garage is also considered acceptable in terms of its impact on the Green Belt. There would also be outbuildings removed next to the dwelling which have a floorspace of 12m² and a volume of 30m³.
- 7.4.6 The cattery part of the site can be considered to be previously developed land, and as such its redevelopment is not considered to be inappropriate provided that it would not have a greater impact on openness than the existing development. The existing cattery buildings are mostly to the southern side of the property and to the rear. These comprise mainly small shed-like buildings with wire mesh sides on concrete slabs, which are located very close together and over a wide area. There are also some larger shed-like buildings. The proposed dwellings (Plots 2 and 3) would be to the southern side of the existing dwelling with the cattery buildings in this location and to the rear removed. The existing floorspace of the cattery buildings in total is approximately 408m² and proposed is 305m², a reduction of 25%. The existing volume is 1082m³ and the proposed is 1132m³ so this would be an increase of 11%. Given the reduction in footprint, this volume increase is considered to be acceptable in terms of the overall impact on openness of the development compared to existing. The existing buildings are single storey in nature and the proposed dwellings would also be single storey with shallow pitched

roofs. As such the bulk and massing of the development, as indicated by the volume calculations, is not considered to be significantly larger than existing.

- 7.4.7 While there is hardstanding proposed by way of the new access within the site, the proposed footprint of the buildings is smaller than existing, and the amount of hardstanding overall would be reduced compared to the existing development. It is therefore considered that the redevelopment of the PDL part of the site would not have a greater impact on openness than the existing development.
- 7.4.8 The residential garden to the rear of the existing property will form the residential gardens for Plots 1 and 2 and as such is not considered to be significantly different in terms of its impact on the Green Belt. While there would be a division of the garden there are already fences on site and the details of the boundary treatments can be secured by condition. Given that the quantum of development is at the limits of acceptability in the Green Belt, it is considered that permitted development rights should be removed to prevent any enlargement of the dwellings however, and prevent any outbuildings being erected. The proposal is therefore not considered to be inappropriate development within the Green Belt as it falls within two of the exceptions under paragraph 89 of the NPPF.

7.5 Impacts on the character and quality of the area

- 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. Policy CP2 requires development to ensure that all land is used efficiently within the context of its surroundings and to respect and enhance the quality of the urban, rural, natural and historic environments.
- 7.5.2 The property is in a continuous line of residential development on this side of the road which includes two cul-de-sacs, Dukes Hill and Dukes Covert. The residential dwellings are generally not visible from the A322 with some exceptions, however are mostly set back behind gates, walls and vegetation to the front. As such while the area is characterised by detached dwellings on fairly large plots, these are of varied design and architectural styles. While the provision of three smaller dwellings on this plot would result in a denser development than the surrounding plots, it would be a reduction in the current built form across the site, and it is not considered likely that Plots 2 and 3 would be clearly visible from the road. Also while Plot 3 is sited side on to the road, given its single storey nature this is not likely to be significantly visible, and the front boundary treatment can be

secured by condition.

- 7.5.3 The design of the buildings has been carefully considered in the context of the existing development and its impact on the Green Belt. The dwellings are all single storey with shallow pitched or part flat roofs, and this reflects the existing single storey nature of the existing dwelling and cattery buildings. Due to the restrictions on volume increase within the Green Belt, anything taller than this would be likely to have a greater impact on openness, although the applicant has amended the designs since they were submitted to feature shallow pitched roofs rather than flat roofs as this is considered to be a better design response.
- 7.5.4 It is acknowledged that the design appears modern rather than traditional but paragraph 60 of the NPPF is clear that planning decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes, and that they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles, though it is proper to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. In this case, the dwellings on Bracknell Road have no distinctive character, other than being detached dwellings as are proposed, and are all of differing architectural styles. The site does not fall within a conservation area, and as such it is not considered there is any basis on which to object to the design of the dwellings. The materials to be used can be required by condition to ensure that they are high quality and result in attractive dwellings. While there is hardstanding proposed by way of the new access road this will be less than exists on the site at present.
- 7.5.5 It is also noted in this regard that the existing dwelling, garage and cattery buildings which are in a dilapidated state (although only the house and garage are visible from the streetscene) do not contribute positively to the appearance of the area and as such the proposed dwellings are likely to be an improvement in this regard. It should also be noted that the front elevation of Plot 1 will be set back from that of the existing dwelling which is only visible to a limited degree through the entrance gate, so Plot 1 will not be any more visible than existing. The top of the side elevation of Plot 3 will be somewhat visible from the A322 depending on front boundary treatments, though this is not considered to be significantly harmful, and Plot 2 is not likely to be significantly visible in the street scene given its set back behind Plot 3. Details of the proposed boundary treatments can also be required by condition.
- 7.5.6 It is therefore considered that, subject to the proposed conditions, that the development is acceptable in character terms and in line with Policy DM9 and the NPPF in this regard.

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 application site shares a boundary with Hardwick House to the north. There are some windows proposed in the mezzanine level of Plot 1 which will face towards the rear garden and as such this is a normal overlooking relationship between neighbouring properties. Additionally, these windows are of limited height and Hardwick House is some 25m from the boundary on the opposite side, with significant mature vegetation in between. No windows are on the side elevation facing this neighbour. The proposed dwelling is of a height and distance away that no overbearing or overshadowing impacts are likely. As such the impact on this neighbour is considered to be acceptable.
- 7.6.3 The application site shares a boundary with Thornlea to the south. This property is approximately 7m from the boundary at its closest point. Plot 2 on this side would be approximately 4.5m from the boundary, and Plot 3 11.3m from the boundary though Plot 3 would be adjacent to the front of the dwelling in any case. Given these distances and the single storey nature of the proposed dwellings, it is not considered that there would be any adverse impacts on this nature in terms of overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking issues. Additionally there is significant mature vegetation along the boundary which is proposed to be retained.
- 7.6.4 The proposed development provides very large residential gardens for Plots 1 and 2 and a moderately sized garden for Plot 3, however all three are considered sufficient for the size of the dwellings. There is not considered to be any harm to amenity between the dwellings themselves such as overlooking, given the distances between them and single storey nature. The windows in the mezzanine level of Plot 1 would have some views of the garden of Plot 2 however this is a normal relationship between neighbours.
- 7.6.5 It is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its impact on residential amenity and in line with Policy DM9 in this regard.

7.7 Highways, parking and access

- 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. 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 Although there is only one dwelling on the site and the proposal would result in three dwellings, this is still likely to have a reduced impact in terms of highway trips than the former cattery use (which is also beneficial in Green Belt terms). The existing single access to the site would be utilised and improved. Each dwelling would have a single garage, a driveway with space for 1-2 cars, and two further parking bays, resulting in a total of 4-5 spaces for each dwelling. This is well in excess of what would be required by the County Highway Authority. The County Highway Authority have not raised objection to the proposals, provided that the access is laid out in accordance with the plans prior to occupation.

7.8 Trees

7.8.1 Policy DM9 states that development will be acceptable where it protects trees and other vegetation worthy of retention and provides high quality hard and soft landscaping where appropriate.

7.8.2 The site currently has significant mature vegetation along the northern and eastern boundaries particularly, and some large mature trees within the garden of the site. Two small category U trees are proposed for removal for good arboricultural management. The Tree Report identifies several category A trees on the site which will be protected and other category B and C trees also will not be removed. The Council's Arboricultural Officer has been consulted and has not objected, subject to a condition requiring tree and ground protection measures having been implemented, and a comprehensive landscaping plan incorporating native (rather than ornamental) species.

7.8.3 The proposed site plan shows some hardstanding proposed to the front in the form of the driveways and access, and to the rear for patios, however the rest of the site would be residential gardens. There are no details of boundary treatments to the front or within the site provided, and as such these details can be agreed within the landscaping plan. It is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable subject to the above conditions and in line with Policy DM9 in this regard.

7.9 Housing Mix and Affordable Housing

7.9.1 Policy CP6 requires mix of dwelling sizes to be broadly 10% 1-bed or 4+bed, and 40% 2 and 3-bed houses. As this proposal is for three houses only, and they are two 3-bedroom dwellings and one 2-bedroom dwelling, the sizes of houses which are most in demand in the Borough would be provided and as such no objection is raised to the proposed mix. The development would not be liable to a contribution in terms of affordable housing as the net increase of dwellings is 2 and Policy CP5

requires a contribution for an increase of 3 or more dwellings.

7.10 Impact on Infrastructure

- 7.10.1 Policy CP12 states that the Borough Council will ensure that sufficient physical, social and community infrastructure is provided to support development and that contributions in the longer term will be through the CIL Charging Schedule. Paragraph 153 of the NPPF states that supplementary planning documents should be used where they can aid infrastructure delivery. The Council's Infrastructure Delivery SPD was adopted in 2014 and sets out the likely infrastructure required to deliver development and the Council's approach to Infrastructure Delivery.
- 7.10.2 The CIL Charging Schedule came into force on 1 December 2014 and details of infrastructure projects that are to be funded through CIL are outlined in the Regulation 123 list, which includes open space, transport projects, pedestrian safety improvements among others. These projects do not have to be related to the development itself.
- 7.10.3 This proposed development is likely to result in a reduction in floorspace compared to the existing development, however it would only be CIL exempt if the existing floorspace has been in use for a period of at least 6 months out of the last 3 years. This is currently being established with the applicant and any updates will be reported to the meeting. If it is CIL liable, CIL would be payable on commencement and an informative regarding CIL would be added.
- 7.10.4 In addition to CIL the development proposed will attract New Homes Bonus payments and as set out in Section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act (as amended by Section 143 of the Localism Act) these are local financial considerations which must be taken into account, as far as they are material to the application, in reaching a decision. It has been concluded that the proposal accords with the Development Plan and whilst the implementation and completion of the development will result in a local financial benefit this is not a matter that needs to be given significant weight in the determination of this application.

7.11 Impact on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA

- 7.11.1 The Thames Basin Heaths SPA was designated in March 2005 and is protected from adverse impact under UK and European Law. Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009 states that new residential development which is likely to have a significant effect on the ecological integrity of the SPA will be required to demonstrate that adequate measures are put in place to avoid or mitigate any potential adverse effects. Policy CP14B of the SHCS states that the Council will only permit development where it is satisfied that this will not give rise to likely significant adverse effect upon the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and/or the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham Common Special Area of Conservation (SAC).
- 7.11.2 All of Surrey Heath lies within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and this site is approximately 650m 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 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. There is currently sufficient SANG available and if this development is CIL liable, a contribution would be payable on commencement of development. If it is not CIL liable, the development would be liable instead for a SANG payment of £112.50 per square metre. This would be payable before the application is determined or by provision of a legal agreement.

7.11.3 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 £1315 which takes into account the existing floorspace.

7.11.4 It is therefore considered that, subject to the payment of SAMM and SANG (if applicable) or a satisfactory legal obligation to secure SAMM and SANG contributions prior to the Committee date, the proposal complies with Policy CP14B and Policy NRM6, and the Thames Basin Heaths SPD.

7.12 Other matters

7.12.1 Policy CP14A states that the Council will seek to conserve and enhance biodiversity within Surrey Heath. Although the existing site is a residential dwelling and cattery, upon undertaking the site visit it was clear that due to the overgrown nature of the site and additionally the fact it backs onto open land, gave rise to the potential for protected species. As such the applicant intends to submit an ecology report as soon as possible and it is hoped that comments from Surrey Wildlife Trust will be reported to the meeting.

7.12.2 The site lies on a wider area of potentially contaminated land which runs across both sides of the A322 and to all sides of the site. Comments are awaited in this respect from the Environmental Health officer and the Environment Agency and any updates will be reported to the meeting.

7.12.3 Policy DM17 states that on sites of 0.4ha or greater an archaeological assessment will be required. This has been provided and Surrey County Council Archaeology have stated that this is acceptable and concludes that there is a relatively low level chance for remains. However County recommends a condition to secure the necessary archaeological work.

8.0 CONCLUSION

- 8.1 The application would provide three homes of 2 and 3 bedroom size which are in need in the Borough. It is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on the Green Belt and there is no objection to the loss of the cattery use. The proposal is also considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on character, trees, residential amenity, highways, parking and access, archaeology, infrastructure and the impact on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, subject to receiving payment of SANG (if applicable) and SAMM prior to Committee or a legal agreement for the same.

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 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.

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:

Amended Ground Floor Plan Type 1 Proposed BC-03-020 P4 received 25.10.16

Amended Ground Floor Plan Type 2 Proposed BC-03-030 P4 received 25.10.16
Amended Ground Floor Plan Type 3 Proposed BC-03-040 P5 received 25.10.16
Amended Proposed Elevations Type 1 BC-05-010 P4 received 25.10.16
Amended Proposed Elevations Type 2 BC-05-011 P4 received 25.10.16
Amended Proposed Elevations Type 3 BC-05-014 P4 received 25.10.16
Amended Location Plan and Block Plan BC-02-005 P4 received 25.10.16
Amended Proposed Site Plan Ground BC-03-010 P4 received 25.10.16
Amended Proposed Site Plan Roof BC-03-011 P4 received 25.10.16
Amended Proposed Roof Plan Type 1 BC-03-021 P4 received 25.10.16
Amended Proposed Roof Plan Type 2 BC-03-031 P4 received 25.10.16
Amended Proposed Roof Plan Type 3 BC-03-041 P4 received 25.10.16

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 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.

4. The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the approved plan BC-02-020 for vehicles to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. Thereafter the parking and turning areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purpose.

Reason: The above condition is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users, in accordance with Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policy Document 2012.

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order), no further extensions to the dwellings hereby approved or additions to their roofs shall be erected under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A or Class B of that Order; and no buildings, enclosures, pools or containers incidental to the enjoyment of a dwelling house shall be erected under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of that order; without the prior approval in

writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the enlargement of the development, in order to preserve the openness of the Green Belt, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. The development hereby permitted shall not be constructed until any additional outbuildings constructed after the date of this permission have been demolished and all resultant debris removed from the site, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the enlargement of the development, in order to preserve the openness of the Green Belt, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall take place in accordance with the approved Scheme.

Reason: In order to prevent harm to or loss of any findings of archaeological or heritage interest, in accordance with Policy DM17 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

8. Prior to commencement of development, full details of both hard and soft landscaping works, and boundary treatments shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details should include an indication of all level alterations, hard surfaces, walls, fences, access features, any existing trees and hedges to be retained, together with the new planting to be carried out. All plant material shall conform to BS3936 Part 1: Nursery stock specification for trees and shrubs. Any trees or plants, which within a period of five years of commencement of any works in pursuance of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced as soon as practicable with others of similar size and species. The planting shall be carried out after completion of the building programme and prior to first occupation and shall be carried out fully in accordance with the approved details.

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 Document 2012.

9. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Report prepared by Transform Landscapes Ltd. [Ben Clutterbuck] and dated 26 November 2015. No development shall commence until photographs have been provided by the retained Consultant and forwarded to and approved by the Council's Arboricultural Officer. This should record all aspects of tree and ground protection measures having been implemented in accordance with the

Arboricultural Report. The tree protection measures shall be retained until completion of all works hereby permitted.

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. Building Regs consent req'd DF5
2. Decision Notice to be kept DS1