



Surrey Heath Borough Council
Surrey Heath House
Knoll Road
Camberley
Surrey GU15 3HD
Telephone: (01276) 707100
Facsimile: (01276) 707177
DX: 32722 Camberley
Web Site: www.surreyheath.gov.uk

Division: Corporate
Please ask for: Eddie Scott
Direct Tel: 01276 707335
E-Mail: democratic.services@surreyheath.gov.uk

To: All Members of the **PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

The following papers have been added to the agenda for the above meeting.

These planning updates were not available when the reports in the main agenda were originally prepared and supplement the information contained in those reports.

Yours sincerely

Karen Whelan

Chief Executive

PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

	Pages
a Planning Applications Committee 10 January 2019 - Planning Updates	3 - 16

This page is intentionally left blank

10 January 2019		
Planning Applications Committee <u>Update</u>		
Item No.	App no. and site address	Report Recommendation
4 Page 9	18/0616 – 18 & 18A Tekels Park, Camberley, GU15 2LF	GRANT subject to conditions
<p><u>UPDATE</u></p> <p><u>Representation</u></p> <p>An objection has been received on behalf of Tekels Park Residents and Tekels Community Association (see Appendix 2). The issues raised include: street scene and design, environmental impact of the proposal, layout, scale and density, parking and road / pedestrian safety, amenity impact.</p> <p>The applicant circulated a response to Members, also appended (Appendix 3).</p> <p><i>Officer's comment: These issues are broadly covered in the Committee Report.</i></p> <p><u>Amended recommendation and additional condition</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following concerns that were raised about the management and maintenance of the flat roof, the applicant has agreed to accept a condition to agree the details of Management and Maintenance with the LPA. As such the following condition is recommended to be added to the decision notice: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>17. Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, a Management and Maintenance Plan, for the external surfaces and flat roof of the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</i> <i>Reason: In the interests of residential and visual amenities of the area and to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.</i> • The applicant has completed a legal agreement to secure SAMM and Affordable Housing contributions and as such the recommendation changes from - <i>GRANT subject to conditions and completion of a legal agreement.</i> to - <i>GRANT subject to conditions.</i> 		
5 Page 33	18/0499 – 45 Guildford Road, Bagshot, GU19 5JW	GRANT subject to conditions
<p><u>UPDATE</u></p> <p>The applicant has provided a letter (Appendix 1) to clarify the reasons for locating the proposed parking area to the front of the site, summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relocation of parking to the rear of the site would negate any ability to provide 		

private amenity space.

- Additionally, following long discussions with the Environment Agency, a landscape strategy had to be developed to overcome their objection in respect of impacts on the Windle Brook bank. This involves provision of a landscaped buffer zone between the brook and the gardens to encourage the development of wildlife within the brook and flora and fauna along the bank. These environmental benefits would be lost if any parking was provided at the rear.
- The parking at the front is now set behind a front boundary wall and landscape planting which can be secured as part of the proposed landscaping conditions.

6

Page 63

18/0513 – 45 Guildford Road, Bagshot,
GU19 5JW

GRANT subject to conditions

UPDATE

As outlined in Item 5 above.

Planning Application for 18/18a Tekels Park – 18/0616
Summary of Objections

1 Introduction

This document has been prepared on behalf of the residents of Tekels Avenue and Tekels Park, who are principally affected by this Planning Application. 31 Objections were originally received by the Council opposing this proposal, and there has been significant further objections posted to the Council or directly to members of the Planning Committee subsequently. Opposition to this proposal is near unanimous in the affected areas. We will be presenting our objections at the Planning Committee Meeting on 10th January, 2019.

2 Street Scene and Design

“The development proposed, by virtue of the scale and massing of the buildings would result in an incongruous, dominant and overly urbanised pocket of development which would fail to respect and enhance the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including the semi-rural and verdant character of the Wooded Hills Character Area”

REFUSAL for Planning Application 14/0621 21-25 TEKELS PARK, CAMBERLEY, GU15 2LE that included a two storey detached building to comprise 4 duplex apartments, dated 23/9/14.

The above is an elegant summary of the potential impact of the proposed development, except that what is now proposed is more than twice the size of the planning application previously rejected, whilst being essentially in the same location.

Tekels Park is covered by the Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2012 and in particular within the Wooded Hills Character Area.

Guiding principle WH1 proposes that new development should be principally two storey detached buildings in individual plots. The proposed development is a two/three storey apartment block, and not individual buildings in their own plots.

Guiding principle WH2, amongst other criteria, states that development forms contrary to the prevailing development forms should be resisted. There are no substantial apartment blocks in Tekels Park, and no flat roof structures either, both characteristics of this planning application. The flat roof will be not be a positive contribution to the streetscape as asserted in the Planning Officer's report as it is completely at odds with the surrounding houses. It is merely proposed in order to reduce what would otherwise be an unacceptable height to the building.

The corten panels proposed are completely alien to the Park, where existing construction is essentially of brick, stone and wood, and this steel fronted industrial type structure is totally out of keeping. Also, the panels are stated as giving a bronzed finish when in reality they give a very unsightly rusty appearance which stains materials coming into contact with them. There are also environmental concerns about corten steel once it has been incorporated into buildings. A study published in [Environmental Pollution](#) found that water runoff from weathering steel may cause problems in the local aquatic environment. The study found that the additional amounts of nickel, iron, and manganese in the area local to a weathering steel building were “not negligible.” This issue has not been addressed at all in the Planning Officer's Report or in prior environmental surveys.

Paragraph 56 of the NPPF concerns good design. It states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute

Planning Application for 18/18a Tekels Park – 18/0616

Summary of Objections

positively to making places better for people. Paragraph 58 states that planning policies and decision should aim to ensure that developments:

- Will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development
- Establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit
- Optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development
- Respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation.

This proposed building satisfies none of those principles.

3 Layout, Scale and Density

The Planning Officer's Report seeks to equate the extant permission (SU16/1115) with the current proposal in terms of layout and scale. This comparison is invalid, as there is an 11m gap in the extant permission between the two developments, which completely alters the entire massing effect. This point is best expressed with the following two illustrations:

Proposed Street Scene



Extant Permission Street Scene



The Planning Officer also draws comparison to the Guest House as an established wider building in the area. However this is not a domestic dwelling, was built long before the Wooded Hills Character Area policy was adopted, and would never have been accepted under its provisions.

Planning Application for 18/18a Tekels Park – 18/0616

Summary of Objections

Guiding principle WH2 also states that net densities above 9 dph are considered out of keeping with the soft enclosed, semi-rural character. The proposed development is on a plot of 0.4 hectares, and therefore has a density of 25 dph (not about 20 as stated in the Planning Officer's Report). In practice, a considerable part of this plot is not actually available for construction due to its nature, so the effective plot size from the point of view of massing is nearer to 0.2 hectares, giving an effective dph of nearer 50. The Planning Officer's argument that principle 6.4 of the RDG seeks to achieve the highest possible densities is completely negated by the qualifying phrase, which insists that this must be 'without compromising local character'

4 Parking

The current plans for 12 parking spaces, whilst in accordance with planning provision, will in practice be totally inadequate. The likely owners would be working couples who would invariably be two car households and would need more visitor parking than provisioned. The development is too far from schools, shops and railway station to assume pedestrian access would be satisfactory – it being a 1.2 mile walk up and down two steep hills to Camberley Station and along dangerous roads (see below).

Parking on the very narrow access roads in Tekels Park would inevitably ensue, would lead to a loss of amenity for existing residents, and would become a safety concern to the young families currently living opposite the proposed development. Street parking will further compromise access to emergency and other vehicles. It would not be unreasonable to assume that, were this development to be approved, it would likely lead to post development pressure for further tree removal to augment the site parking. It thus conflicts with the objectives of the Western Urban Area character SPD and NPPF.

5 Road and Pedestrian Safety

A major area of concern is the increase in traffic this and subsequent developments will generate along Tekels Avenue and into Tekels Park. The Planning Officer's Report asserts that Highways have raised no objections to the proposal. The document actually reads "The application site is accessed via Tekels Drive (!), which is a private road and does not form part of the public highway, therefore it falls outside The County Highway Authority's jurisdiction", so in fact no opinion was expressed.

The issue of accidents along the road, and near misses, has prompted the community to pay for a private traffic safety survey and to consult widely with residents about their driving experiences along the road. Two accidents in recent years have resulted in insurance claims of £6,000 and £19,000, both caused by construction vehicles driving on the wrong carriageway. A quick survey of 29 residents revealed 27 had had an accident or near miss on Tekels Avenue in the past year, these 27 people having had 163 driving incidents in total on Tekels Avenue in that period.

The road is poorly lit, and not at all suitable for pedestrians as it has no pavements and has no safe place to stand on the 90 degree bend when two vehicles pass. The road is not safe to walk along in the dark as a recent serious attack has evidenced. 25 of our survey respondents have had a near miss whilst walking on Tekels Avenue in the past year, reporting a total of 146 incidents. This is a worrying situation for home owners to have to contend with on a daily basis.

We must also consider the real danger that large construction vehicles pose on Tekels Avenue, which has a 90 degree blind bend without enough room for a large vehicle and a car to safely pass. This is evidenced by a swept path analysis commissioned by the Tekels Community Association which showed that it was impossible for vehicles larger than 7.5

Planning Application for 18/18a Tekels Park – 18/0616

Summary of Objections

tonnes to safely navigate the bend, and to even pass at certain pinch points on the road. Buildings of the nature proposed will inevitably involve multiple deliveries using 40 tonne and larger vehicles. It is not unusual for large vehicles to completely block Tekels Avenue or Tekels Park, and also to reverse (without a flagman) the mile length of it because it is impossible for them to turn. This situation potentially blocks the passage of emergency vehicles, and there was a recent incident where carers were prevented from visiting a seriously ill resident in Tekels Park. We accept that some construction traffic is inevitable, but this proposal would seriously exacerbate an existing problem.

As residents we have become increasingly concerned about the level of traffic on this poorly lit road which has no pavements, and we have yet to see the impact of the extra 20+ cars per day from the under-construction Walled Garden. If development were to be in accordance with recommended Wooded Hills Character Area densities then increased volumes can be absorbed if carefully managed, but we maintain that the additional vehicles generated by this proposal and similar ones that it will generate will add unacceptable risk to other road users.

6 Environment and Amenity Impact

Historically, Tekels Park has always been a place of retreat and eco diversity. It is one of the last green corridors and only Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) within the Camberley Town Centre ward. A negative impact on the environment and loss of biodiversity including of protected species are likely to arise from the proposed overdevelopment, as a result of an increase in dog walking, general recreational use and damage to the habitat within the designated area. A thriving bat colony has already been lost due to development. However, this issue has not been addressed in the Planning Officer's report.

The hardstanding parking provision, whilst inadequate for this development in our opinion, is a concern and an eyesore to properties 21 and 23a who will look upon this and will have a significant impact on their amenity, as will the unsightly bin stores opposite no 21. Pictures in the Planning Officer's report are not of no 21 which is the property most affected by this development but of 23a and 23b who are set back much further than 21.

No assessment appears to have been made of the impact on utility services in Tekels Park, and in particular in areas where there are already existing issues, such as:

- Water pressure
- Sewerage
- Broadband speeds and stability

We appreciate that these are not regarded as planning issues, but they do have a fundamental impact on the residents of Tekels Park, and the current piece by piece development approval process is exacerbating these concerns.

Whilst the Planning Officer has considered the potential impact of noise from the M3, he has not considered the amenity impact on the near neighbours of the additional noise that will be generated from increased refuse collection (potentially in larger vehicles), increased traffic noise from new residents and shopping deliveries, slamming car doors, etc. The right to peaceful enjoyment of the environment and ambience of Tekels Park, a considerable factor in many people acquiring properties in the area, will be seriously compromised.

Planning Application for 18/18a Tekels Park – 18/0616

Summary of Objections

7 Precedent and Strategic Impact

When granting approval to the Tekels Park Walled Garden Development (17/1031), which comprised mainly semi-detached dwellings, on fairly regular plots, without side gardens, and of considerably higher density than surrounding dwellings, the Planning Officer acknowledged that the proposal was not in line with many of the Guiding Principles of the Wooded Hills Housing Character Area. However, she considered that given the **unusual and unique** setting of the application site with the locally listed wall surrounding it, **that an exception could be made to some elements of the character guidance**, taking into account also the benefit to the wall that would result.

Leaving aside the argument as to whether the Walled Garden development should ever have been approved in the form that it was, no such exception exists or has been claimed for the current proposal. We were assured that the Walled Garden development would NOT be used as a precedent for any future applications, and yet this very precedent was clearly cited in the Planning Application.

The SPD clearly states 9 dph as the maximum density acceptable in the Wooded Hills Character Area. The Walled Garden development in the end was around 20 dph. The current proposal is for a density of 25 dph (or 50 dph if you discount the unusable land and focus on the actual development site itself). There is clearly a major density escalation, and whatever the council says about “each application being treated on its own merits” approval for the current proposal WILL establish a precedent with no exceptional characteristics.

Approval of this application will inevitably lead to further applications for blocks of flats or high density construction in Tekels Park and the wider Wooded Hills Character Area, which will be increasingly hard to resist. Indeed, approval will effectively sign the death warrant for the Wooded Hills Character Area SPD policy. The core of the issue is all about maintaining a sustainable density for this unique area. Adding to the risk of a negative impact to the environment and ambience of Tekels Park will be proposals to open up new road access points into the Park, thus further exacerbating traffic, noise and pollution issues.

It is the existence of policies such as the Wooded Hills Character Area that enable development to be controlled at a strategic level, and to resist development ‘creep’ and the salami effect of treating each application on its own merits. The Council needs to acknowledge this point, and if it is not prepared to back and enforce the Wooded Hills Character Area, then it needs to consult and replace it with proposals workable in the current environment.

8 Conclusion

Even leaving aside the strategic impact of approval, this current proposal is badly flawed on numerous counts, as set out in this document. We believe that we have addressed at least 13 issues that are generally considered valid objections in a planning context.

We are not anti-development, just in favour of **appropriate** development, and we recognise that the Council is under severe pressure to increase the number of dwellings in the Borough. A perfectly good development proposal that meets the Wooded Hills Character Area in terms of density and most other criteria exists, and has been approved for this site (SU/16/1115). We urge the Council to REFUSE the current application and urge the developer to get on with implementing the extant permission.

* Please note that our submission is in respect of the proposed development. While we have taken every effort to present accurate information for your consideration, as we are not a decision maker or statutory consultee, we cannot accept any responsibility for unintentional errors or omissions.

This page is intentionally left blank

**DAVIS**PLANNING^{LTD}

Chartered Town Planners

Members of the Planning Committee
Surrey Heath Borough Council
Surrey Heath House
Knoll Road
Camberley
Surrey
GU15 3HD

9th January 2019

Dear Councillor

18/18A Tekels Park, Camberley
Erection of building to provide 10no. apartments

I refer to the application at the above mentioned site which is due to be heard at the Planning Committee on 10th January 2019 and to the ‘Summary of Objections’ submitted by local residents.

I act as town planning consultant for the owner and applicant, Lux Homes. Lux Homes are a locally based developer that have already undertaken a number of successful projects within the Borough including the refurbishment and extension of the former job centre along the A30.

The application was the subject of detailed discussions with officers including pre-application discussions and meetings earlier in 2018. Officers welcomed the design principles being put forward and we have acted upon the minor comments which they raised which were primarily related to neighbour amenity and spacing to the neighbouring boundary. As a result, the application is now recommended for approval. In response to the objections which have been raised in the ‘Summary of Objections’, I would make the following points:

- i) The reference to the building being of a three storey height is correct. However, as there is a significant change in levels towards the rear of the site, the appearance from the street scene will be of a two storey building which we have broken up using changes in the materials;
- ii) Reference has been made to the fact that there are no other ‘substantial’ apartment blocks on Tekels Park and no flat roof structures. The main point



here is that this is a highly unusual site within Tekels Park as it has a very wide frontage to the street, approaching 150 metres in length. The design has been chosen including its flat roof and contemporary appearance as it is located on the end of a street scene within a substantial plot with a treed setting. We strongly feel that the design, including its flat roof and the materials will complement its setting and therefore do not feel that there would be any conflict with WH2. A management company will ensure that the flat roof and external materials are kept free of litter from the trees and maintained;

- iii) Tekels Park is comprised of a very wide array of building types, designs of various ages and materials and given the extensive size of this plot we feel that an exciting new building would be entirely appropriate. The corten steel finish is only one aspect of the external elevations and has been chosen specifically due to its compatibility with its host environment.
- iv) I'm afraid that we fundamentally disagree with the comments that have been made about the potential for pollution from this material. The project architects have discussed how this can be avoided with the manufacturer and there are three solutions in place, all or some of which can be pursued. It should be remembered that there are only three sections of the building using this material with the remainder being timber and glazing:
 - a)The pre-patination of the panels deals with much of the process and so there is much less chance of contaminated water entering the ground;
 - b)A French drain at the base to catch the run off from the panels and intercepts the stained water and send it to the foul water system;
 - c)Protective coating such as Owatrol Oil which seals the panels;
 - d)Alternative synthetic materials are also available.
- v) The officer's comments in relation to comparing this proposal with the extant permission are concerned with the outward spread of development. There is no suggestion in the officer report that that the extant permission does not have a break in between the buildings. The key point here is that by pursuing a single detached building for apartments, we will be able to provided an open rear amenity area and not a series of smaller plots which are not in keeping with the area. It will also enable the treed areas to be maintained under one single management plan;
- vi) The refence to the upper limit of 9dph is misleading. The key consideration here is the development plan (the 9 dph comes from a supplementary



planning guidance) which encourages the efficient use of land particularly in the light of the fact that the Council do not have a adequate 5 year housing land supply;

- vii) The Council's parking standard is being met with the addition of two visitor spaces. There is no evidence that a scheme which is overproviding already will overspill and result in any loss of amenity;
- viii) In terms of the impact on highway safety (Tekels Park is a private road), the highway authority can only consider how a proposal impacts upon the adopted highway. It is normal practice for deliveries and construction parking etc to be dealt with by condition (i.e. a construction management plan). Parking for construction vehicles will be available within the proposed permanent parking area.

In summary, this proposal will not result in the harm alleged. The officers have assessed this proposal at a pre-application and full application levels and found it to be acceptable. They accept that the provision of a single building offers real benefits to landscape management and agree that the principle of a contemporary design in an area with a mixed character would enhance its setting as well as helping to meet an identified housing need and requirement.

Finally, I will be circulating to all members a further visualisation of the proposal to illustrate how it will sit within the site and I expect this to be available tomorrow morning. The officer will have this available for the presentation.

I would therefore urge members to support the officer recommendation to grant planning permission.

Yours faithfully

Neil Davis

Cc All Members of the Planning Committee

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1

Brookes Architects

Upstairs at The Grange
Bank Lane London SW15 5JT

T 020 8487 1223

F 020 8876 4172

E info@brookesarchitects.co.uk

www.brookesarchitects.co.uk

Our Ref: 4963PBLA.DOC
Your Ref: 18/0499
18/0513

3 January 2019

For the Attention of Mr R Cahalane

BY EMAIL

Development Control
Surrey Heath Borough Council
Surrey Heath House
Knoll Road
Camberley
Surrey GU15 3HD

Dear Sirs

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 45 GUILDFORD ROAD, BAGSHOT

We understand that there was some discussion at the site visit today regarding parking to the front of the site and that you would like us to clarify the rationale behind our design proposals.

Firstly, the layout of car parking to the front and private gardens to the rear is a traditional arrangement which provides private amenity space to the rear (usually sheltered from the road) and avoids the introduction of traffic and any disturbance to the rear of any adjoining properties. Furthermore, the car parking will be closely connected to the road, reducing travel distances and any potential pollution to the rear.

Secondly, the introduction of any car parking to the rear would negate any ability to provide private amenity space to the houses or flats, an important and integral feature of the design, which complies with your standards as acknowledged in your reports. No-one in the surrounding area would want cars turning next to their back gardens.

Thirdly, we have had long and complex discussions with The Environment Agency at their offices and, with their input, have developed a landscape scheme to the rear that will provide significant environmental improvements to the stream, its bank and the surrounding area. With their encouragement, we have provided a three metre buffer zone between the stream and the private gardens, giving significant benefits to this part of the stream, encouraging the development of wildlife within the brook itself and providing an area to the rear of the site to encourage flora and fauna within the neighbourhood. These environmental benefits would be lost if any parking was provided at the rear.

Cont/....

RIBA 
Chartered Practice



The parking itself has been very carefully designed, hidden behind a front boundary wall of high quality and screen planting after discussions with you, the details of which will presumably be covered by condition. The cars will hardly be seen and will have virtually no impact on the streetscene. We note that the details of the parking comply with all of your standards and have been accepted by Surrey County Highways.

No doubt you will be able to explain to your committee that the significant environmental benefits to the ecological buffer zone at the rear of the site will far outweigh any disadvantages to the area of well designed and suitably screened parking to the front, however, if you need anything further, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours faithfully

ff. Paul Brookes

BROOKES ARCHITECTS LTD

cc: Mr M Jennings, Homes by Warwick Ltd