
Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 20 September 2016

Site visit made on 20 September 2016

by Andrew Dawe BSc(Hons) MSc MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/W/15/3139682

Land to the east of Benner Lane, West End, Surrey

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Southern Heritage Developments Ltd. against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 15/0445, dated 15 May 2015, was refused by notice dated 15 October 2015.
 - The development proposed is residential development comprising the erection of 95 No. dwellings, together with vehicular and pedestrian access, car parking, landscaping and open space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for residential development comprising the erection of 95 No. dwellings, together with vehicular and pedestrian access, car parking, landscaping and open space at Land to the east of Benner Lane, West End, Surrey in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 15/0445, dated 15 May 2015, subject to the conditions in the attached Annex.

Application for costs

2. At the Hearing an application for costs was made by Southern Heritage Developments Ltd against Surrey Heath Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matter

3. In determining this appeal I have had regard to the appeal decision Ref APP/D3640/W/15/3028247 which allowed the erection of 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 (the Kings Road decision). I have also had regard to outline planning permission Ref 16/0323 for up to 85 dwellings at Land north of Beldam Bridge Road along with other decisions issued by the Council that were submitted.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect on housing provision, taking account of local and national planning policies; the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; whether it would preserve
-

the setting of the Grade II Listed Malthouse Farmhouse and associated granary outbuilding (the LBs); the effect of the proposed development on the capacity of the local road network, and on highway safety in respect of the amount of parking provision and activity and visibility relating to the proposed site accesses; and the planning balance having regard to housing provision.

Reasons

Housing supply

5. Since the appeal was submitted, the Council has confirmed that it no longer contests the first reason for refusal concerning conflict with the Borough's spatial strategy. This is on the basis that it agrees that it cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply (HLS) and that therefore, having regard to paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the relevant development plan policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date. From the evidence submitted, I have no basis to disagree with the Council's position.
6. It is therefore necessary to consider the proposal in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development as was the case with the Kings Road decision. As set out in paragraph 14 of the Framework, 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 in the Framework taken as a whole, or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted. I have therefore determined the appeal on that basis.
7. The site is open countryside land outside of the settlement boundary of West End. Policy CP1 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (the CS&DMP) states that new development will come forward largely through redevelopment of previously developed land in the western part of the Borough. It identifies West End as a smaller village which has limited capacity to accommodate development and that this will be achieved primarily through redevelopment of existing sites. This does not preclude the development of other sites although it states that development in the countryside beyond the Green Belt which results in the coalescence of settlements will not be permitted. The site's development would not result in the coalescence of settlement, and there would remain significant separation from the nearest neighbouring settlement. Although this is a policy for the supply of housing, the appeal scheme would not conflict with its aims.
8. Policy CP3 of the CS&DMP restricts the release of sustainable sites in the countryside beyond the Green Belt, until after 2025, if insufficient sites have come forward within settlement areas. This is also subject to proposed development having no adverse effect upon the integrity of European Sites, an issue that I will address later in this decision letter in respect of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA).
9. The site is identified by policy H8 of the Surrey Heath Local Plan 2000 (the Local Plan) as a housing reserve site on land excluded from the Green Belt, in order to meet possible long-term development needs beyond the period covered by the Local Plan. Before that, the policy states that the site will remain subject to the restrictions on development set out in policy RE3 of the

Local Plan which seeks to protect the countryside beyond the Green Belt for its own sake.

10. With regard to it being a sustainable location, it is immediately adjacent to an existing settlement. Furthermore, the identification of the site as part of a Housing Reserve Site under policy H8 of the Local Plan indicates that it is regarded as an acceptable location for new housing in the event of strategic housing requirements not being able to be met by the release of other more appropriate land. This has already been taken into consideration in respect of those planning permissions relating to the Kings Road decision and Ref 16/0323, for a total of up to 169 dwellings, which relate to the same Housing Reserve Site.
11. There may be other more sustainable sites in terms of location, but I have received insufficient substantive evidence to indicate that such sites are both currently available for development and would remove the HLS deficit, taking account of those extant planning permissions referred to above.
12. Policy H8 of the Local Plan and policies CP1 and CP3 of the CS&DMP are policies that relate to the supply of housing. As stated, there is no conflict with policy CP1. Development would not accord with the broad timescales in policies H8 and CP3. However, in light of the current shortage in the supply of deliverable housing sites in the Borough, a delay in bringing other sustainable sites forward would run counter to the Framework's objective to boost significantly the supply of housing and, with the exception of reference to European sites, the policies are out of date. The scheme would provide 95 houses of which 38 would be affordable. In light of the shortfall and for the above reasons, I attach substantial weight to the provision of housing. I address this further in my planning balance.

Character and appearance

13. The site currently comprises a large green field area of undeveloped countryside, albeit that part of it forms part of an existing garden area for Malthouse Farm. It therefore has intrinsic open and rural countryside characteristics that would be largely and inevitably lost as a result of the proposed development. It is nevertheless separated from the wider open countryside by existing residential properties and a primary school, and associated land, together with substantial tree cover adjacent to its boundaries. Development of the site would therefore relate, to some degree, to the existing adjacent settlement pattern in terms of those confines, without encroaching upon the segregated wider countryside.
14. The density and nature of existing housing in the vicinity varies. Whilst the density of that proposed would be fairly high in some parts of the site, those proposed dwellings closest to existing public vantage points along Benner Lane and Fairfield Lane would broadly reflect the spacing of those existing nearest to them. They would also be set away from the roadside boundaries by varying degrees, with existing road frontage trees largely retained along with some supplementary planting that would have a softening effect. The proposed dwellings would therefore not be dominating features of the streetscapes of those adjacent roads.
15. Within the site, a large number of existing mature trees would be retained which would also contribute to creating visual breaks in the built form of the

overall development. So would the proposed area of open space in the centre of the site immediately to the north-east of Malthouse Farm. The higher density part of the site at its eastern end, where there would also be more car parking directly adjacent to the street, would not be clearly visible from those existing public vantage points. Furthermore, I note that there would be some scope for softening this with new tree planting. Views out from the school would continue to remain fairly open to the west whilst the proposed development would be significantly softened by existing vegetation alongside the intervening school boundary.

16. For these reasons, the proposal would not appear out of place in the context of the density and layout of existing established housing in the vicinity and would ensure that a degree of openness would be retained at this edge of settlement location. It would also retain some of the existing site features, notably a significant number of mature trees, that would help it to further integrate into this edge of settlement location.
17. Policies CP2 and DM9 of the CS&DMP relate to the requirement for high quality designed development that respects and enhances the character of the environment be it in an urban or rural setting. There would be some conflict with those policies in respect of the effect of the proposal on the site's intrinsic countryside characteristics. However this would be lessened to a degree in light of my findings concerning its separation from the wider open countryside. In all other respects, for the above reasons, there would not be any other unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Setting of the LBs

18. The LBs comprise the main dwelling of Malthouse Farmhouse which is a 16th Century timber framed dwelling, re-fronted in the 17th Century, together with the associated 17th Century granary outbuilding listed for its group value. The LBs no longer relate to a working farm, although they are clearly surrounded on two sides by open fields which provide a reference to that former farm use. That setting therefore contributes to some degree to the significance of the LBs, albeit that they are not clearly seen in that context from a number of vantage points due to the screening or softening effect of intervening vegetation.
19. Due to the site's location adjacent to the LBs, special attention has to be paid to preserving their setting. The proposed development would remove a lot of the rural context referred to above. However, importantly, a fairly substantial area of open space and a number of existing mature trees would be retained to the north-east of the former farm buildings. That would ensure some degree of recognition of the farmstead's former connection to the countryside. The distinctive spaciousness of the LBs' immediate setting would also be maintained as they would continue to be set within a large plot, including a retained wide road frontage. The characteristic significant amounts of vegetation adjacent to the plot boundaries, particularly the north-western one and along much of the roadside, would also maintain the pleasant verdant nature of that immediate setting.
20. Therefore, taking account of the above factors, and having regard to paragraphs 132 and 134 of the Framework, harm to the significance of the LBs would be less than substantial. I have weighed this against the substantial public benefit of the proposal in terms of boosting the supply of housing in the

borough including the provision of affordable housing, particularly in light of the Council's 5 year HLS position and conclude on this matter that such a benefit would outweigh that less than substantial harm.

21. As such, in respect of this issue, it would conflict with Policies CP2 and DM9 of the CS&DMP to a degree, which, amongst other things require historic environments to be respected and enhanced. However, in taking account of section 12 of the Framework relating to conserving and enhancing the historic environment, whilst recognising the great weight attached to the conservation of these designated heritage assets, it would not conflict with that section as a whole given the over-riding public benefits of the proposal.

Capacity of the local road network, and highway safety

22. I have had regard to concerns raised about increased traffic in the area, particularly at key road junctions, as well as in respect of existing on-street parking in front of the site, including at school drop off and pick up times.
23. A Transport Assessment was submitted by the appellant, including cumulative impact with the Kings Road and Land north of Beldam Bridge Road proposals, together with modelling undertaken of key local road junctions. It was identified that the A322 Guildford Road North/Kerria Way/Guildford Road South/Fellow Green junction was close to capacity but that a scheme could be implemented through CIL funding to ensure that this would be improved, taking account of the cumulative impact of proposed new developments in the area. Such CIL funding would also have the potential to support any other highway improvements were these deemed necessary in the future although no other significant capacity issues have been forecast as a result of the proposal. A Travel Plan to promote sustainable patterns of movement could also be secured by condition which would have the potential for reducing the amount of private car use.
24. Furthermore, there would be sufficient parking within the site for the respective dwellings, and the provision of two separate access points onto Benner Lane would be likely to avoid an over-concentration of activity at either of those new junctions. Appropriate visibility splays would also be achievable at those junctions.
25. Neither the Council nor County Council, the Local Highway Authority, have raised any objections in terms of highway capacity and safety. This is subject to the need for conditions to secure those visibility splays referred to, the proposed vehicle parking, including for cycles, the submission of a Construction Transport Management Statement and the implementation of the Travel Plan. Based on the submitted evidence, I have no reason to disagree with that position and am satisfied that the proposal would accord with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the CS&DMP which together relate to movement, traffic management and highway safety.

Other matters

26. A Unilateral Undertaking (the UU) has been submitted by the appellant in relation to securing the proposed affordable housing on the site and a financial contribution towards strategic access management and monitoring (SAMM) measures in accordance with the Council's Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document 2012

(the SPD). The Council confirms that the UU would address the second and third reasons for refusal relating to the absence of such an obligation.

27. I am satisfied that the proposed affordable housing would be necessary and in accordance with policy CP5 of the CS&DMP.
28. In respect of the SAMM contribution, this relates to the need to protect the ecological integrity of the SPA from pressure due to the recreational activity of residents of the proposed new development. This is given that it lies approximately 0.6 kilometres from the site, only approximately 0.2 kilometres nearer than the Kings Road appeal site. Policies NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009 and CP14 of the CS&DMP, along with the SPD, together set out the requirements to ensure such protection. This includes mitigation in the form of providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) which is land sufficiently close to the proposed development, suitable for recreational use so as to deflect such use away from the SPA. The CIL charge for which the appeal proposal would be liable would ensure that the appropriate provision would be made for SANGS.
29. The Chobham SANGS has come forward since the Council's decision and that relating to the Kings Road appeal. I acknowledge that the SPA is close to the site and so would be likely to be used by residents of the proposed development. However, it is equally likely that existing residents closer to the SANGS, who might currently use the SPA, would make greater use of the SANGS instead.
30. I have also had regard to any cumulative impact on the SPA with those other recently approved major developments referred to above. In respect of the Kings Road appeal, account was taken of this issue, and provision made, without the prospect of utilising the Chobham SANG. Notwithstanding that, I have received no substantive evidence to indicate that its capacity would be insufficient to serve that development, along with that relating to permission Ref 16/0323 at Land to the east of Benner Lane and the appeal proposal.
31. For the above reasons, it is unlikely that there would be a harmful net increase in the use of the SPA as a result of the appeal proposal, including vehicular travel to and around it in terms of pollution generation.
32. The Framework confirms in paragraph 119, that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where development requiring appropriate assessment under the Birds or Habitats Directives is being considered, planned or determined. In this case the proposed SAMM contribution would, in combination with the SANGS provision, provide mitigation to make it unlikely that the proposed development would have a significant effect on the SPA. As such, no further consideration of appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations is required and the preclusion on applying the presumption in favour of sustainable development under paragraph 119 does not come into effect.
33. I have had regard to the use of a condition to ensure that the SANGS would be secured prior to commencement of development with no occupation until works have been completed to bring it up to an acceptable standard. However, as the Chobham SANGS has now come forward, I consider such a condition unnecessary.

34. In respect of the UU, both with regard to provision for affordable housing and the SAMM contribution, for the above reasons I am satisfied that it would meet the tests set out in paragraph 204 of the Framework. I have had regard to a request from Surrey County Council for financial contributions towards primary and secondary education. However, I have received insufficient substantive justification for such contributions in the absence of information concerning the particular needs and capacities specific to the local schools that would be affected. Such a contribution would therefore not meet the tests set out in paragraph 204 of the Framework.
35. The construction phase of the proposed development would inevitably introduce additional noise and activity on the site and in its vicinity. However, this could be controlled to an acceptable level through a Construction Method Statement (CMS), which could be secured by condition.
36. Once operational, the proposed development would introduce more general activity to the local area particularly in terms of noise caused by additional vehicles on the roads. However, the Council highlights that based on the submitted acoustic report, the level of such an increase would be unlikely to amount to any significant impact on the living conditions of local residents. I have no reason to disagree with that position. Furthermore, I have no substantive basis to consider that there would be a material increase in pollution in the area from car fumes.
37. Concerns have also been raised by local residents about the likely deficiencies of various other aspects of the local infrastructure in being able to cope with or make adequate provision for the proposed increase in dwellings. In this regard, the proposed development would generate a CIL payment which would be used for making any improvements to various types of local infrastructure necessitated by the introduction of new development in the area. Such a payment would therefore be likely to mitigate any additional impacts on those aspects of infrastructure covered by the Councils CIL charging schedule.
38. In terms of maintaining adequate privacy and light to and outlook from existing dwellings adjacent to or opposite the proposed development, the primarily two storey heights of those nearest proposed dwellings together with the separation distances involved would be likely to preserve those amenities to an acceptable level. The existing and proposed tree planting around the edges of the site would further mitigate the development's impact in this respect.
39. I have had regard to the effect on the site's ecology and the Ecological Assessment Report (EAR) submitted. The proposal would inevitably impinge on ecological features of the site due to it currently being a countryside site. However, a significant amount of undeveloped space would remain, including a large number of the existing trees. Furthermore, I am satisfied that any effects would be mitigated to an acceptable degree through the implementation of the recommendations of the EAR and have received insufficient substantive evidence to the contrary.
40. In terms of any concerns relating to increased crime and anti-social behaviour, I have received no substantive evidence to indicate that the design of the proposal would inherently have such an effect.

Planning balance

41. The Framework sets out that there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development and indicates that to achieve that, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system.
42. The proposed development would provide a significant amount of much needed housing for the Borough, including affordable housing which, in the circumstances of the current deficit in the supply of deliverable housing sites, weighs substantially in favour of the proposal. I have also found that this would outweigh the less than substantial harm that would be caused to the setting of the LBs. I have found that there would be some harm caused by the inevitable loss of intrinsic countryside characteristics of the site by introducing built form to the site but that this would be lessened to a degree by its separation from the wider open countryside. There would also not be any other unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area or in respect of the capacity of the local road network and highway safety.
43. Development would not accord with the broad timescales in policies H8 and CP3. However, the land is needed now in light of the identified shortage of much needed housing land. Furthermore, Policy H8 of the Local Plan has identified this site as being suitable for future housing if necessary, and outside of the Green Belt.
44. Therefore, and in also taking account of all other matters raised, there would be no adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. It would therefore be a sustainable form of development for which there is a presumption in favour. This is a material consideration which outweighs any conflict with the development plan.

Conditions

45. The Council has suggested a number of conditions that it considers would be appropriate were I minded to allow the appeal. I have considered these in the light of advice in the Government's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). For clarity and to ensure compliance with the PPG, I have amended some of the Council's suggested wordings, omitted one condition and added another.
46. The standard time condition is required in this case, and for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans is also required.
47. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area and setting of the LBs, conditions would be necessary requiring the approval of external facing materials; hard and soft landscaping, including an implementation programme and management plan; and measures to protect retained trees.
48. A condition to ensure the implementation of the recommendations set out in Sections 4.0 and 5.0 of the submitted Ecological Assessment Report would be necessary in the interests of nature conservation.

49. Full details of the proposed play area on the site would be necessary, in the interests of providing appropriate recreational amenity for future residents and the character and appearance of the area.
50. In the interests of highway safety, conditions would be necessary to secure details of the proposed accesses onto Benner Lane, including visibility splays; the implementation of the proposed parking and garage spaces; and a CMS, also needed to protect the living conditions of local residents and to ensure site security. Details of cycle and refuse storage areas would also be necessary to ensure suitability for the respective uses, and in the interests of highway safety and the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, a Travel Plan would be necessary to promote sustainable patterns of movement.
51. Details of surface and foul water drainage systems would also be required to ensure satisfactory capacity and flows, and to prevent flooding.
52. Evidence submitted highlights the unknown archaeological potential of the site. Together with the large area of the site, there is the potential for unexpected heritage assets to be present and which could be destroyed by the proposed construction works. As such, and as agreed by the parties, an additional condition to secure the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation would be necessary, prior to development taking place.
53. A condition is suggested relating to the removal of permitted development rights for any further hardstandings, extensions, garages or other buildings in the interests of the health of retained trees and visual and residential amenity. Paragraph 200 of the Framework states that planning conditions should not be used to restrict national permitted development rights unless there is clear justification for doing so. The PPG advises that conditions restricting the future use of permitted development rights or changes of use will rarely pass the test of necessity and should only be used in exceptional circumstances. The nature of those aspects of development listed above, if implemented as permitted development, would generally be unlikely to cause material harm. In the absence of any specific evidence to the contrary, I consider such a condition in this case to be unreasonable and unnecessary.
54. I have found that an additional condition, relating to ensuring the provision of the SANGS would not be necessary in order to protect the SPA.

Conclusion

55. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Andrew Dawe

INSPECTOR

Annex

Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 13-P934-LP, 01 (Rev F), 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 500 (Rev A), TMC-13066-S (Rev B), TMC-13066-L.
- 3) No development shall take place until details and samples of all external facing materials, including the proposed bricks, tiles, guttering and fenestration, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The relevant works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved sample details.
- 4) No development shall commence until details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include:
 - i. earthworks showing existing and proposed finished levels or contours;
 - ii. hard surfacing materials;
 - iii. boundary treatments;
 - iv. access features;
 - v. the existing trees and hedges to be retained;
 - vi. new planting;
 - vii. an implementation programme;and shall build upon the aims and objectives of the BS5837:2012 - Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction Arboricultural Method Statement. The landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the agreed implementation programme.
- 5) Before the development is first occupied a landscape management plan, including management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas other than privately-owned domestic gardens for a minimum period of five years, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The schedules shall include details of the arrangements for their implementation. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved.
- 6) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations set out in Parts 5, 6 and 7 of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment by Tree Management Consulting LLP dated May 2015 unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 7) The development hereby approved shall be implemented in accordance with the recommendations set out in Sections 4.0 and 5.0 of the Ecological Assessment Report by Aspect Ecology dated May 2015 unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- 8) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, the play area shown indicatively on Dwg 13-P934-01 Rev. F shall be provided in accordance with details which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 9) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, the proposed vehicular/pedestrian accesses to Benner Lane shall be provided in accordance with full details, including visibility splays, which shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The visibility splays shall thereafter be retained, as approved, in perpetuity.
- 10) The respective parking and garage spaces shown on the approved drawings for each residential unit shall be provided prior to the first occupation of that unit to which they relate and thereafter kept available at all times for the parking of motor vehicles by the occupants of that dwelling and its visitors and for no other purpose.
- 11) No development shall take place until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for:
 - i) the parking of vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors;
 - ii) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - iii) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - iv) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding;
 - v) hours of construction and on-site delivery;
 - vi) a programme of works (including measures for traffic management);
 - vii) there being no on-site burning of material during the site clearance and construction phases.The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.
- 12) No development shall take place until a Travel Plan to promote sustainable patterns of movement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Travel Plan shall thereafter be implemented.
- 13) No development shall take place until details of cycle and refuse storage areas and access thereto have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The respective storage areas relating to each residential unit shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of that unit to which they relate and thereafter retained as such.
- 14) No development shall take place until full details of the surface and foul water drainage systems have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The surface water drainage system details shall include measures to ensure attenuation of the 1:100 year event with allowance for 30% climate change. The approved systems shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved.

- 15) No development shall take place until a programme of archaeological work has been implemented in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Gwion Lewis	Landmark Chambers
Douglas Bond	Appellant's agent (Woolf Bond Planning)
Clive Richardson	Director of Southern Heritage Developments Ltd.
Nick Collins	KM Heritage

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Chris Wilmshurst	Vail Williams
------------------	---------------

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Guy Consterdine	West End Action Group
Jeffery Llewellyn	West End Action Group
Beulah Kingston	West End Action Group
Diane Doney	Local Resident
Ian Allard	Local Resident

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING:

- 1 Signed and dated Unilateral Undertaking.
- 2 Copy of Local Plan Policy RE3 and extract from proposals map.
- 3 Signed Statement of Common Ground.
- 4 Council's rebuttal statement against the appellants' application for an award of costs.
- 5 Heritage Appraisal by KMHeritage.
- 6 Copy of decision notice for planning application Ref 15/0590 relating to Heathpark Wood, Heathpark Drive, Windlesham.
- 7 Copy of decision notice for planning application Ref 15/0880 relating to Land adjacent to The Inglenook, 67 Benner Lane, West End.
- 8 Copy of letter to Diane Doney from Department for Communities and Local Government dated 18 April 2016.
- 9 Extract from Council website relating to Current SANG Provision.

