

22 November 2017

**Planning Applications Committee
Update**

Item No.	App no. and site address	Report Recommendation
12 Page 207	17/0610 72-74 Guildford Road, Lightwater	REFUSE

UPDATE**THE APPLICATION HAS BEEN WITHDRAWN**

For the sake of completeness the following update would otherwise have been provided had the application not been withdrawn :

Final comments have been received from County Highways Authority (CHA) and an objection has been raised. The Highway's officer comments are below:

The County Highway Authority is not yet satisfied that the development would be compatible with the local highway infrastructure. Therefore, to enable the CHA to consider the proposals further, the applicant will need to address and provide further information on the following matters:

1. A new access onto a 30 mph road should be provided with visibility splays of 2.4 m x 45 m in both directions free of any obstruction above 1.05 m in height and therefore the achievable splay should be shown on a drawing also showing the location of the arch over the access to demonstrate that this will not impede sight lines onto Guildford Road. The height of the arch should also be provided to ensure that it is sufficient to accommodate service/delivery vehicles.
2. A pedestrian visibility splay of 2m by 2m should be provided on each side of the access and shown on the application drawings.

3. It is proposed to provide 11 cycle parking spaces for the flats but no cycle parking provision is provided for either the retail unit or the users of the club. The applicant should investigate how additional cycle parking can be provided on site to address this. I would consider that at least one cycle space could be provided in front of the retail unit subject to there being sufficient space and at least two cycle spaces should be provided for the club.

It is understood that the gardens for the dwellings may be too small to accommodate dedicated cycle parking. If this is the case and it is proposed to provide this within the dwellings themselves then the applicant should demonstrate how this will work. Any cycle storage provided within the dwellings should be for that specific use.

4. The applicant proposes to provide automatic gates at the access. The gates should be set back a minimum of 7 metres from the back of the footway to ensure vehicles do not obstruct the public highway whilst waiting for the gates to open particularly given that the site access is located adjacent to a zebra crossing and the high level of pedestrian activity in the vicinity and its proximity to a bus stop.

Information should also be provided on how the key fob entry system will work particularly for unscheduled deliveries and how the refuse vehicle will access the site when the gates are likely to be closed. Details should also be provided explaining what system will be in place should the automatic gates fail to operate so vehicles are not backing up on to the highway causing an obstruction to other road users.

The Highway Authority would have no objection if gates were not provided at the access.

Additional reason for refusal

Based on the CHA comments above it is considered an additional reason for refusal should be taken forward as detailed below:

It has not been demonstrated to the reasonable satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the County Highways Authority, that the development would be provided with a safe means of access / egress and would not therefore lead to conditions prejudicial to highway safety. The development proposed is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the NPPF 2012, Policy DM11 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and objective 3 of the Surrey Transport Plan 2011-2026.

It is also suggest that the applicant's attention be drawn to the CHA officer comments (which will need to be addressed in any resubmission) by way of **an additional informative** as detailed below:

The applicant's is directed to the comments provided by the County Highway Authority in the consultation response dated 25 October 2017. Any resubmission for redevelopment of the site must address these comments / requirements.

Amended reason for refusal

1. The proposed development as a result of its height, massing, siting and site coverage would result in a form of development which would enclose and dominate Guildford Road to the detriment of the character of the commercial village centre. Moreover, the site coverage proposed fails to provide any meaningful opportunities for any landscaping or softening of what otherwise will be an unduly urban design response in the commercial village centre. In addition, the depth of the development into the site, coupled with the height and its proximity to, in particular the shared boundaries with No.70 Guildford Road and No.2 All Saints Road, would result in visually dominant and incongruous development forming poor relationships with neighbouring buildings, and, harmful to the spatial characteristics of the area. This harm would be compounded by the design response of Block A which would give rise to development out of keeping with it's setting. The proposed development is

therefore contrary to Policy DM9 (ii) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012, Design Principles B1, B2 and B5 (a) and B6 of the Lightwater Village Design Statement Supplementary Planning Document 2007 and Principle's 7.1, 7.3, and 7.4 of the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017.

13 Page 235	17/0701 Parkgate House, 185-187 London Road, Camberley	GRANT subject to conditions
----------------	---	-----------------------------

UPDATE

Affordable housing viability – The applicant submitted a Viability Report which concluded that providing affordable housing would make the development unviable. The external Viability Consultants have agreed that the scheme does not provide sufficient surplus to be able to fund a contribution in this regard, and as such none will be sought.

14 Page 257	17/0469 Heathercot Yard, Evergreen Road, Frimley	GRANT subject to conditions
----------------	---	-----------------------------

UPDATE

This application will be deferred until December Committee, to allow time for the ownership notices to be served another landowner.

15 Page 303 and 304	17/0761 11 Bramcote, Camberley, Heatherside	GRANT subject to conditions
------------------------	--	-----------------------------

Paragraph 7.3.5 and 7.4.6 replace the RGD with the aforementioned policy documents.

16 Page 292	17/0763 13 Bramcote, Camberley, Heatherside	GRANT subject to conditions
----------------	--	-----------------------------

Paragraph 7.4.6 replace the RGD with the aforementioned policy documents.

This page is intentionally left blank