



**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](http://www.surreyheath.gov.uk)

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

	<b>Pages</b>
<b>a 06 February 2020 Planning Applications Committee - Planning Updates</b>	<b>3 - 6</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

6 February 2020

**Planning Applications Committee  
Update**

Item No.	App no. and site address	Report Recommendation
4 Page 11	18/1089 Land west of 35, Mincing Lane, Chobham	REFUSE

**UPDATE**

- 1) The consultation response from the Urban Design Consultant (UDC) was inadvertently not included at section 5.0 of the committee report. For completeness, the UDC raises no objection to the proposal and section 7.4 of the committee report reflects her comments. She is satisfied that the circulation, design and appearance per se is acceptable in respect to street scene and layout. Notwithstanding this, these UDC comments do not outweigh the substantial harm to the Green Belt, identified at paragraphs 7.2 and 7.3 of the committee report.
- 2) The first reason for refusal has been split into paragraphs to assist with readability, there has been other no changes to its content, see below:

*“The proposal does not constitute 100% affordable housing and the applicant has failed to demonstrate the need for market housing on the site to facilitate this as a rural exception site. In any event, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the development would meet a proven local need for affordable housing within the Parish of Chobham for local people with a local connection to the area; that the need cannot be met within the settlement boundary; and, that the development would provide affordable housing for local people in perpetuity.*

*As such the proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which is harmful by definition; and, by reason of its quantum of built form, height, scale and mass, would cause further significant harm to the openness of the Green Belt and conflict with the purposes for including land within it.*

*No very special circumstances exist to outweigh this Green Belt harm and the other harm identified in reasons 2 - 4 below. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies CP1 and DM5 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework”*

- 3) On the 30<sup>th</sup> January 2020 the applicant also made the following representations in response to the publication of the committee report:

*“Officers omit to mention that this site is allocated as a Rural Exceptions site in the Issues and Options paper published by the council in June 2018”*

Officer’s comment

The site is recognised in the 2018 document and in the more recent Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) 2019. The SLAA’s relevancy is fully considered at paragraphs 7.2.6 and 7.2.7 on page 19 of the committee report. However, for the avoidance of doubt and as set out in the committee report, it is not considered that the site meets the rural exception tests.

The applicant also states that the site is:

*"...also one of the sites identified for immediate development in the council's 5 year housing land supply paper."*

**Officer's comment**

To confirm, the application site is **NOT** included in the 5 Year Housing Land Supply Paper.

5 Page 65	18/0875 Land to the side and rear of 154 Guildford Road, West End	REFUSE
--------------	---	--------

**UPDATE**

**DEFER.**

6 Page 95	19/0006 154 Guildford Road, West End	REFUSE
--------------	---	--------

**UPDATE**

No updates.

7 Page 141	19/0728 9 Heywood Drive, Bagshot	GRANT subject to conditions
---------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------

**UPDATE**

There is a typo at paragraphs 7.2.2 and 7.3.8, references to **800m** should read **800mm**

8 Page 151	19/0675 Bagshot Manor, 1 Green Lane, Bagshot	GRANT subject to conditions
---------------	--	-----------------------------

**UPDATE**

Correction (pages 83 and 87)

The proposed parking provision for the 79 flats is 80 spaces rather than 87, as referred to in paras 4.4 and 7.6.1 of the committee report. This provision is subject to the separate Prior Approval application (19/2321/GPD) pending decision. A total of 87 spaces were proposed for the previous Prior Approval applications for 85, 84 and 83 units (with the 83 unit scheme approved only).

Clarifications on assessment of current applications

An additional planning application (20/0012/FFU) has been received for 4 x 3-bed dwellings and 1 x 4-bed dwelling to the south of the site. This is outside of the red line boundary of the subject application and will be considered on its own planning merits.

The current live applications at this site are therefore as follows:

- 19/0675 - Installation of rooflights and fenestration alterations in connection with the

residential use approved under Prior Approval 19/0271.

- 19/2321/GPD - Application for the prior approval under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class O of the General Permitted Development Order for the conversion of the existing building to provide 79 flats across three floors.
- 20/0012/FFU - Erection of 5 dwellings comprising 4 x 3 bed semi-detached and 1 x 4 bed detached with associated landscaping and parking.

The planning considerations vary for each of the above applications, and it is necessary to clarify how each application relates to each other:

The application before Committee relates to external alterations to the existing building only. As such, the key issues to be considered include impact on character (Section 7.4 of the committee report) and impact on neighbouring amenity (Section 7.5).

Impact on highways (Section 7.6) is subject to the current 19/2321/GPD Prior Approval application.

The 20/0012/FFU application for five dwellings to the south is subject to full policy consideration, as like any other full planning application. These proposed houses would be provided with their own parking and would be outside of the other application site boundary for the flats. Therefore, the dwellings would not utilise any parking spaces proposed for the flats.

### Representations

One additional objection has been received, summarised below:

- Out of character  
*[See Section 7.4]*
- Overbearing impact, overlooking and loss of amenity to neighbouring properties
- Flats are below the nationally described space standard  
*[See Section 7.5]*
- With all the extra cars this development would generate, residents will not want to cycle
- Will charging points be provided for the all-electric cars of the future?  
*[Officer comment: See Section 7.6. A condition could be imposed under the 19/2321/GPD Prior Approval, if granted, requiring provision of fast charge sockets. This approach was taken under the previous 19/0271 Prior Approval as set out in the Annex on Page 93]*
- Site is in a flood risk zone - will any of them be able to obtain insurance cover?  
*[Officer comment: See Section 7.9. Flood risk is a formal consideration under the 19/2321/GPD Prior Notification]*
- No need for this type of accommodation in Bagshot
- Better to provide good quality homes for fewer people, including small families who have trouble finding suitable lower-cost homes in the area  
*[Officer comment: The site is subject to a Prior Approval application via a Government Development Order. This is therefore not a full planning application, and is subject to stipulated criteria which do not cover the above considerations.]*
- Article 4 directions could be used to protect the wellbeing and amenity of existing and new residents  
*[Officer comment: It is not considered that an Article 4 Direction to cover this site would be successful, given its location outside of a defined Core Employment Area]*

Representations received on other live applications (for information purposes only)

The additional objector also comments that this application has been held on the interim publisher and that many more objections have been received under the other current applications. Whilst these representations will be considered separately under their respective application, the comments received to date on these other live applications are summarised below, for information purposes only:

- 19/2321/GPD (Prior Approval application) - 18 objections received from 14 addresses so far, raising the following additional concerns:
  - Overdevelopment of site
  - Insufficient amenity space
  - Increased pollution (cars, noise – additional impacts on weekends)
  - Will add to congestion on Green Lane – many cars already parked on roadside – school located at end of road
  - Additional weekend traffic
  - Whitmoor Road is already congested – links to Connaught Park estate and A322
  - Previous office use rarely saw car park full
  - Inadequate parking for flats and visitors
  - Inadequate public transport
  - Tree line around site needs to be protected and maintained
  - Effect on local ecology
  - Impact on local facilities – school, health, jobs
  - No evidence of storage of domestic waste
  - One bed flats will not attract families and will spoil ethos of area
  - This type of development is not the answer to any housing shortage
  - Development has been maximised for profit rather than providing quality housing
  - Previous approval for 35 units is more reasonable use of the site
  - The development is near the local Junior school which (also the venue for the local youth club). surrounded by family housing and opposite Mead Court sheltered housing. Allowing such a development in this location and the potential social issues that could arise is not acceptable
  - Councils are withdrawing their tenants from such accommodation
  - Impact on property prices
  
- 20/0012/FFU (5 new dwellings) - 5 objections received so far, summarised below:
  - Would not be opposed to 5 houses, but if flats are granted the parking for the flats will be lost