

LOCATION: LAND REAR OF, THE PARADE, FRIMLEY, CAMBERLEY
PROPOSAL: Erection of four buildings to comprise 3 detached four bedroom dwelling houses and 2 semi-detached three bedroom dwelling houses with associated carport's/garages, parking and access and alterations to existing car park/service areas.
TYPE: Full Planning Application
APPLICANT: Mr Richmond-Dodd
Laimond Property investment Company Limited
OFFICER: Mr N Praine

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 Ian Sams. This is because of the need to consider access and egress, overlooking and loss of car parking.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to conditions

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 The proposal is for a total of 5 dwellings i.e. the erection of four, two storey buildings to comprise 3 detached four bedroom dwelling houses and 2 semi-detached three bedroom dwelling houses with associated carports/garages, parking and access. The proposal relates to the carpark to the rear (south side) of The Parade in Frimley. As well as the existing formal carpark, the site also includes a triangular piece of land which has part implemented planning consent for a carpark extension. This proposal seeks to overcome the 2016 refusal (16/0631) which was dismissed on appeal. A copy of the Inspector's decision letter is appended as Annex 3.
- 1.2 The proposal is considered acceptable. In terms of its impact on ecology, character, residential amenity and tree grounds no objections are raised. Likewise the County Highway Authority has not objected and it is not considered that the proposal would cause any significant amenity issues in terms of parking or access. It is therefore recommended that permission should be granted, subject to conditions.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site is loosely triangular shaped and is located on the southern side and to the rear of the Parade Frimley High Street within the settlement area of Frimley. The north western side of the site comprises a long established formal parking area for 13 parking spaces. The south eastern side of the site comprises a part implemented but not completed carpark extension *[see paragraph 3.3 below]*.

- 2.2 The site is bordered by residential properties to the east, south and west and an electricity substation to the north with the Frimley High Street Parade beyond. There are fences and some mature landscaping on the boundaries of the site with the residential properties and a steel palisade fence defines the boundary with the electricity substation. The site lies within a “Commercial Nodes” character area as defined within the Western Urban Area Character SPD 2012.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 SU/01/0132 Change of use of land ancillary to electricity sub-station to surface car park with ancillary works. *Approved in June 2001.*
- 3.2 SU/06/0122 Renewal of planning permission SU/01/0132 for the change of use of land ancillary to electricity sub-station to surface car park with ancillary works. *Approved in May 2006.*
- 3.3 SU/15/0083 Change of use of land to provide a car park extension with associated development. *Approved in May 2015 and part implemented.*
- 3.4 SU/16/0631 Outline application for the erection of 7 No. residential dwellings, with vehicular access, car parking with alterations/reduction to existing public car park/servicing areas (all matters reserved) – refused December 2016 in respect of harm to the character of the area, insufficient appropriate ecological information and lack of affordable housing.

Following this refusal an appeal was submitted with the Planning Inspectorate on the 13th June 2017 with the following reference APP/D3640/W/17/3177807. On the 3rd November 2017 the Planning Inspectorate dismissed the appeal and a copy of the Inspector's decision letter is appended as Annex A. This appeal was dismissed for the following summarised reasons.

- The principle of development was found to be acceptable as was the impacts upon the general character of the area [paragraph 21]
- The Inspector found the likely close proximity of new dwellings to the boundaries of the land would be likely to cause overlooking of neighbouring properties which would result in harm to the living conditions of these neighbouring dwellings [paragraph 10]
- However the inspector found the access to be acceptable both in character terms and highway safety stating: *‘there is no technical evidence before me that the separate route proposed would not provide a safe access arrangement or that the reconfiguration of the car park would have a material effect on the economic benefit to the commercial centre of Frimley’.* [paragraph 8]

- In respect to ecological matters the Inspector found that the development proposed would not result in the loss of an area recognised to be of importance for ecological diversity. [Paragraphs 16 and 22].

4.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The proposal is for a total of 5 dwellings i.e. the erection of four, two storey buildings to comprise 3 detached four bedroom dwelling houses and 2 semi-detached three bedroom dwelling houses with associated carports/garages, parking and access. The proposal relates to the carpark to the south of The Parade in Frimley. The site includes a triangular piece of land which has part implemented planning consent for a carpark extension and part of the existing car park. The access to the proposed dwellings is from Cedar Lane and across the edge of the existing, to be retained, section of the car park.
- 4.2 Plot 1 would be sited to the north east of the site and would be 7m approx. in width and 11m approx. in depth. It would have an eaves height of approximately 5.0m and ridge height of approx. 8.8m with a pitched roof. Plot 1 would have 4 bedrooms and also an attached single garage with an approx. footprint of 3.4m by 6.3m and a maximum pitched roof height of approx. 4.8m. This plot would have 3 off street parking spaces.
- 4.3 Plot 2 would be sited to the east of the site and would be 7m approx. in width and approx. 11m in depth. It would have an eaves height of approximately 5.0m and ridge height of approx. 8.8m with a pitched roof. Plot 2 would have 4 bedrooms and also an attached single garage with an approx. footprint of 3.4m by 6.3m and a maximum pitched roof height of 4.8m. This plot would have 3 off street parking spaces.
- 4.4 Plots 3 and 4 are proposed as a semi-detached pair and would be sited to the south eastern side of the site. The overall building will measure 12.5m approx. in width and approx. 10.2m in depth. They would have an eaves height of approximately 5.0m and ridge height of approx. 8.8m with a pitched roof. Both plots would have 3 bedrooms and also both would enjoy attached single garages with an approx. footprint of 3.4m by 6.3m and a maximum pitched roof height of approx. 4.8m. Each plot would have 2 off street parking spaces.
- 4.5 Plot 5 would be sited to the north west of the site and would be 10.7m approx. in width and approx. 8.7m in depth. It would have an eaves height of approximately 4.5m and ridge height of approx. 8.1m with a pitched roof. Plot 5 would have 4 bedrooms and also a detached car port with an approx. footprint of 6.5m by 6.5m and a maximum pitched roof height of approx. 4.8m. This plot would have 3 off street parking spaces.
- 4.6 The main differences between this application and the appeal scheme are as follows:
- The previous application was an outline application with all matters reserved. The current proposal is for a full detailed planning application.

- The previous application was for 7 dwellings split between 5, two bedroom and 2, three bedroom units. The current scheme is for 3, four bedroom and 2, three bedroom units.
- The access has been re-sited to the north east edge of the carpark whereas previously it ran to the south and west of the carpark.
- Increased landscaping and ecological mitigation zones have been introduced as part of the current application.

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|---|
| 5.1 | Surrey County Highway Authority | No objection, subject to conditions and informative. |
| 5.2 | Scottish & Southern Energy | At the time of writing this report no response received, any comments received will be reported as an update. |
| 5.3 | Thames Water | No objection subject to informative. |
| 5.4 | Council's Arboricultural Officer | No objection, subject to condition. |
| 5.5 | Surrey Wildlife Trust | No objection, subject to condition and informative. |
| 5.6 | Surrey Heath Scientific Officer. | No objection subject to condition and informative. |
| 5.7 | Surrey Heath Drainage Officer. | No objection subject to condition. |

6.0 REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 At the time of preparation of this report 4 letters of objection have been received and one letter of support. The objections raised can be summarised as follows:
- Loss of privacy, overlooking and loss of light [*Officer comment: See Paragraph 7.5*]
 - Impact on, and loss of, trees/woodland [*Officer comment :See Paragraph 7.4*]
 - Impact on wildlife habitat [*Officer comment: See Paragraph 7.9*]
 - Impact of noise, light, dust and air pollutants from future occupation [*Officer comment: This is covered under, other, Environmental Health (nuisance / pollution) legislation*]
 - Impact on drainage; [*Officer comment: The Drainage Officer has considered the application and raises no objection subject to conditions to agree drainage details, see paragraph 7.10.2*]

- Negative impact on highway safety through increased traffic demand [*Officer comment see paragraph 7.6*]

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 CP1, CP2, CP3, CP5, CP6, CP11, CP12, CP14A, CP14B, DM9, DM10 and DM11. It will also be considered against the advice within the Western Urban Area Character SPD 2012 and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document 2012, the Surrey Heath Residential Design Guide 2017 (RDG) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The refused planning application under reference SU/16/0631 and the dismissed planning appeal for this application are also material considerations.

7.2 The main issues to be considered are:

- Principle of the development;
- Impact on local character and trees;
- Residential amenity;
- Highways, parking and access;
- Impact on infrastructure;
- Impact on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA;
- Ecology; and
- Other matters.

7.3 Principle of the development

7.3.1 Policy CPA states that new development will largely come forward through land in the western part of the borough and states that Frimley is a sustainable location. The NPPF seeks to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes and to significantly boost the supply of housing, and at present Surrey Heath does not have a five year housing land supply. Policy CP6 seeks a mix of dwelling sizes.

7.3.2 This proposal would contribute 3 and 4 bed dwellings to housing supply and the site is in a sustainable location near to shops and public transport interchanges. The site also lies in the settlement area. The Planning Inspector [*see paragraph 3.4 above*] in the recently dismissed appeal found no objection with the principle of development at this location or to a similar housing mix, the Inspector also found that the reconfiguration of the car park would not have an adverse impact on the economic benefit to the commercial centre of Frimley and as such, taking all these factors into account there is no objection to the principle of the redevelopment of this site for housing or the dwelling sizes and types as proposed.

7.4 Impact on local character and trees

7.4.1 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, and that high quality hard and soft landscaping should be provided. Policy CP2 requires development to respect and enhance the character and quality of the area.

- 7.4.2 The Western Urban Area Character SPD 2012 indicates that the “Commercial Nodes” character area is defined as having “*a dominance of the retail and business activities in a form of strip development. The buildings in these small centres reflect a small scale character which is in line with their local/neighbourhood function.*” Principle 6.6 of the RDG states that new residential development should respond to the size, shape and rhythm of surrounding plots, Principle 6.7 states that parking should be softened by landscaping, Principle 7.4 that new residential development should reflect the spacing, heights and building footprints of existing buildings. Principle 6.9 states that car parking should not be dominant in the street scene.
- 7.4.3 In respect to the previous proposal, the appeal Inspector found that the site lies at the transition between the commercial area (The Parade and High Street areas) and the adjacent residential areas. The Inspector concluded that the access being formed along the car park to a residential development, in this district centre location, was appropriate and the change to the appearance of the area would be acceptable [Paragraph 8, Annex A]. The Inspector also stated that ‘the main element of the appeal site is visually distinct from the properties at Burleigh Road and Leonard Close / Sheridan Road’. In practice, the Inspector considered that, development on the appeal site would rarely be seen in the context of the adjacent existing houses (from public vantage points) [Paragraph 9, Annex A].
- 7.4.4 In a bid to overcome the Inspector’s concerns regarding the quantum of housing on the site, this current proposal has reduced the number of dwellings from 7 units to 5. The reduction in building density has allowed for more spacing around the proposed buildings and more opportunities for landscaping. The proposed dwellings have been designed to reflect the eaves and ridge heights of surrounding development and they have been designed in a traditional way with bay windows and gable features adding interest and articulation to the building frontages. Exact materials and finish are to be agreed via condition, if minded to approve. The dwellings have adopted an informal layout which is appropriate for this cul-de-sac location and the properties enjoy spacing around them as not to appear cramped. The access has changed over the previous scheme and this is considered to be an improvement as it is moved away from adjoining residential properties yet still follows the circulation areas of the existing car park. Having regard to the planning history and previous appeal decision, it is not considered that a character objection can be sustained on these grounds.
- 7.4.5 Since the appeal decision the applicant has proceeded with the lawful ground clearance works associated with planning consent reference SU/15/0083 (see paragraph 3.3 above). This consent originates back to 2001 (see paragraph 3.1 above) and was renewed in 2006 (see paragraph 3.2 above) and again in 2015 (see paragraph 3.3 above). While the loss of tree cover and landscaping is regrettable, this is lawful and within the stipulations of the planning approval

SU/15/0083 as the landscaping as previously proposed was to be installed prior to first use of the carpark, after construction was complete. That said, the current scheme shows landscaping to be incorporated around the site boundaries and around the car parking areas and the Council's Arboricultural Officer raises no objection subject to a detailed condition wherein tree species, amounts and heights/widths can be specified with a management programme and replacements in the event any are removed, die or become diseased.

7.4.6 The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on character and in line with the relevant policies in this regard.

7.5 Residential amenity

7.5.1 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. Principle 8.1 of the RDG states that new development should be provided with a degree of privacy and respect that of neighbouring properties, Principle 8.2 states that all habitable rooms should maintain one main window with adequate outlook and Principle 8.3 states that good quality daylight and sunlight should be provided.

7.5.2 All neighbouring dwellings (except number 12 Leonard Close) are sited at least 20m with number 12 Leonard Close being sited approximately 19.75m away. This level of separation is generally accepted as appropriate for development of this nature not to cause any significant overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing issues.

7.5.3 The primary living areas and gardens of the new dwellings are considered to have sufficient access to daylight and sunlight. Likewise all primary rooms have an adequate outlook. The rear gardens of the proposed dwellings are also considered to be of an appropriate size and layout.

7.5.4 It is therefore considered that the proposal will provide a sufficient standard of amenity for future occupiers and will not adversely impact upon neighbouring properties which include the following properties, numbers 56 - 72 Burleigh Road, 2-18 Leonard Close, 80- 84 Sheridan Road, Priory Cottage, Cedar Lane, Little Priory, Cedar Lane, Priors Kitchen, Cedar Lane, The Flats Above The Parade, The Flats In Cedar House, Cedar Lane and The Old Coach House, Cedar Lane, and will not compromise the amenities of any other neighbouring property to an unacceptable degree. The proposal is therefore considered to be in line with the relevant policies in this regard.

7.6 Highways, Parking and Access

7.6.1 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. Policy CP11 requires all new development to be appropriately located in relation to public transport and comply with the Council's car parking standards.

- 7.6.2 The proposal would provide off street parking spaces for the proposed dwellings in line with the County Highway's parking standards. The site plan shows that the car park would be reconfigured with the loss of 13 existing car parking spaces (73 spaces retained) to accommodate the houses and to provide a separate access leading to the main part of the site. The applicant has also produced 18 month survey data to show maximum parking demand in the car park is for 68 spaces. The County Highway Authority (CHA) have considered the application and not raised any highway safety or parking objections subject to conditions and informative. The CHA have reconsidered the application including the new access and state that: 'the proposed dwellings will not result in a significant increase in vehicular movements during the peak hours and the parking meets the minimum parking standards'. In addition the Planning Inspector, in respect of the previous proposal, also found no technical evidence that the access proposed would not provide a safe arrangement or that the reconfiguration of the car park would have a material effect on the economic benefit to the commercial centre of the Frimley Shopping Parade [Paragraph 8, Annex A].
- 7.6.3 Given the above information regarding parking, access and advice from the County Highway Authority, it is not considered that the proposal would cause any significant amenity impacts in terms of parking and no objections are raised on these grounds.
- 7.6.4 The County Highway Authority has requested conditions in respect of provision of electric charging sockets and a Construction Transport Management Plan. It is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable in this regard, subject to conditions.

7.7 Impact on Infrastructure

- 7.7.1 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.
- 7.7.2 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. This development would be CIL liable the amount of CIL payable would be in the region of £119,880.

7.8 Impact on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA

- 7.8.1 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).
- 7.8.2 All of Surrey Heath lies within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and this site is approximately 2km 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.
- 7.8.3 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 depends on the sizes of the units proposed. This proposal is liable for a SAMM payment of £3566 which has been paid.
- 7.8.4 It is therefore considered that the proposal complies with Policy CP14B and Policy NRM6, and the Thames Basin Heaths SPD.

7.9 Ecology

- 7.9.1 Paragraph 109 of the NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and minimising the impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible. Policy CP14A states that the Borough Council will seek to conserve and enhance biodiversity within Surrey Heath and development that results in harm to or loss of features of interest for biodiversity will not be permitted. The applicant has provided an Ecological Appraisal which concludes that the site is not covered by any statutory or non-statutory wildlife site designation. The submitted report also found no evidence of any protected species. The report makes recommendations which include works to take place outside of the bird breeding season (i.e. over the period September–February), or, if during the breeding season, immediately after a check by an experienced ornithologist that verifies nesting bird absence. It is recommended that opportunities for biodiversity enhancement in the form of new native tree and shrub planting, and the provision of integrated bird and bat boxes into new buildings. Enclosed bat boxes incorporated into south facing elevations of the new dwellings, in a location to be agreed by an experienced bat worker is also recommended.

- 7.9.2 Surrey Wildlife Trust in their consultation response has not objected, although they note that it is 'highly regrettable' that the development site appears to have been clear felled prior to the submission of this application. The deciduous woodland and any protected species that were present within the footprint of the development site therefore appear to have been removed. That said, the officer cannot ignore the previous consent dating back to 2001 which was renewed in 2006 and most recently granted and part implemented in 2015 (see paragraphs 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3) all ecological requirements have been undertaken in respect of these previous permissions. Likewise the Planning Inspector stated that the site is not important as a natural habitat for species and the development proposed would not result in the loss of an area recognised to be of importance for ecological diversity.
- 7.9.3 Therefore subject to a condition to ensure that the biodiversity enhancements recommended in the report and by Surrey Wildlife Trust are implemented, which will incorporate a landscape and ecological management plan (LEMP), the proposal is considered to be acceptable in ecological terms. The LEMP will include numbers and locations of bat and bird boxes; full details of all proposed landscaping species; and, a description of all ecological aims, objectives, work schedules and management responsibilities to include monitoring, remediation and legal / funding for the ecological enhancements.

7.10 Other matters

- 7.10.1 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.
- 7.10.2 The site does not lie within Flood Zone 2 or 3, however, the Council's Drainage Officer advises that the site is likely to suffer from a high water table across parts of the site and on that basis soakaways are unlikely to be suitable in certain areas. That said, he is confident that a solution can be found and recommends that technical drainage details are to be agreed via condition. On this basis no objections are raised.
- 7.10.3 The application site is on land adjacent to an electricity substation, which has been at the present location for many years and the LPA's Scientific Officer considers this to be a contaminative use. Part of the development land is also a former tarmac car park which is likely to have had car park run off and as such this is also considered a contaminative use by the Scientific Officer. Given both a tarmac car park and an electricity substation can lead to contamination of soil and groundwater, the Scientific Officer recommends a contamination condition (with informative) if minded to approve the planning application.

8.0 CONCLUSION

- 8.1 The proposal for the development of this site for 5 dwellings is considered to be acceptable in all regards, subject to conditions and in line with the relevant policies. It is therefore recommended that permission should be granted.

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. 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.

3. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscaping works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved, and implemented prior to first occupation. The submitted details should also include an indication of all level alterations, hard surfaces, walls, fences, access features, boundary treatments, the existing trees and hedges to be retained, together with the new planting to be carried out.

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.

4. Building on the submitted Ecology Report by Applied Ecology Ltd dated March 2018, A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), including long term design objectives, management responsibilities/timescales and maintenance schedules for all landscaped areas and ecological mitigation zones shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the development, or any phase of the development whichever is the sooner, for its permitted use. The Landscape Management Plan shall be carried out as approved unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

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 the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. Prior to commencement of development a scheme to deal with contamination of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, once agreed, the development shall be carried out and completed wholly in accordance with the agreed details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include :-

- (a) a contaminated land desk study and suggested site assessment methodology;
- (b) a site investigation report based upon (a);
- (c) a remediation action plan based upon (a) and (b);
- (d) a "discovery strategy" dealing with unforeseen contamination discovered during construction;
- and (e) a "validation strategy" identifying measures to validate the works undertaken as a result of (c) and (d)
- (f) a verification report appended with substantiating evidence demonstrating the agreed remediation has been carried out

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory strategy is put in place for addressing contaminated land, making the land suitable for the development hereby approved without resulting in risk to construction workers, future users of the land, occupiers of nearby land and the environment generally in accordance with Policies CP2 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. No development shall commence until a Construction Transport Management Plan, to include details of:

- (a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
- (b) loading and unloading of plant and materials
- (c) storage of plant and materials

has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction of the development

Reason: The condition above is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to accord with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied unless and until each dwelling is provided with a fast charge socket (current minimum requirements - 7 kw Mode 3 with Type 2 connector - 230v AC 32 Amp single phase dedicated supply). in accordance with a scheme to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: The condition above is required in order that the development is to accord with Section 4 'Promoting Sustainable Transport' in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

8. The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans: 18-J2314-LP, 18-J2314-10, 18-J2314-11, 18-J2314-12, 18-J2314-13, 18-J2314-14, 18-J2314-15 and 18-J2314-16 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.

9. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Report prepared by QUARTET DESIGN dated March 2018. 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.

10. No development shall take place until full details of surface water drainage systems are submitted and approved in writing by the LPA. The surface water drainage system details to include attenuation of 1:100 year event at 30% climate change. Once approved the details shall be carried out prior to first occupation in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development and to accord with Policies CP2 and DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative(s)

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

3. In respect to the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) condition above. For the avoidance of doubt the LEMP should include the following as a minimum

- Description and evaluation of features to be managed and created including measures to compensate for lost trees,
- Numbers and locations of bat and bird boxes, including provision integral to the design of the new buildings,
- Full details of all proposed landscaping species, amounts and heights and widths
- Aims and objectives of the site landscaping and ecology management,
- Appropriate management options to achieve aims and objectives,
- Prescriptions for management actions,
- Preparation of a work schedule for securing biodiversity enhancements,
- Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the LEMP
- Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.
- Details of legal / funding mechanisms.

4. For the avoidance of doubt, the following definitions apply to the above condition relating to contaminated land:

Desk study- This will include: -

- (i) a detailed assessment of the history of the site and its uses based upon all available information including the historic Ordnance Survey and any ownership records associated with the deeds.
- (ii) a detailed methodology for assessing and investigating the site for the existence of any form of contamination which is considered likely to be present on or under the land based upon the desk study.

Site Investigation Report: This will include: -

- (i) a relevant site investigation including the results of all sub-surface soil, gas and groundwater sampling taken at such points and to such depth as the Local Planning Authority may stipulate.
- (ii) a risk assessment based upon any contamination discovered and any receptors.

Remediation action plan: This plan shall include details of: -

- (i) all contamination on the site which might impact upon construction workers, future occupiers and the surrounding environment;
- (ii) appropriate works to neutralise and make harmless any risk from contamination identified in (i)

Discovery strategy: Care should be taken during excavation or working of the site to investigate any soils which appear by eye or odour to be contaminated or of different character to those analysed. The strategy shall include details of: -

- (i) supervision and documentation of the remediation and construction works to ensure that they are carried out in accordance with the agreed details;
- (ii) a procedure for identifying, assessing and neutralising any unforeseen contamination discovered during the course of construction
- (iii) a procedure for reporting to the Local Planning Authority any unforeseen contamination.

5. In respect of the, fast charge socket, condition above. It is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that the electricity supply is sufficient to meet future demands and that any power balancing technology is in place if required. Please refer to <http://www.beama.org.uk/resourceLibrary/beama-guide-to-electric-vehicle-infrastructure.html> for guidance and further information on charging modes and connector types
6. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to obstruct the public highway by the erection of scaffolding, hoarding or any other device or apparatus for which a licence must be sought from the Highway Authority Local Highways Service.
7. With regard to surface water drainage, the applicant is reminded to follow the sequential approach to the disposal of surface water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water DeveloperServices will be required. Should you require further information please refer to their website. <https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-forservices/Wastewater-services>
8. There may be public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you discover a sewer, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. The applicant is advised to read Thames Water's guide, "working near or diverting our pipes". See <https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>.
9. Thames Water will expect the developer to demonstrate what measures will be undertaken to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Groundwater discharges typically result from construction site dewatering, deep excavations, basement infiltration, borehole installation, testing and site remediation. A Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water will be required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. Permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management

Team by telephoning 02035779483 or by emailing wwqriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk. Application forms should be completed on line via www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality.

10. In respect of the surface water drainage condition above. The applicant is reminded that the site is not suitable for soakaways and suffers from a high water table in parts of the site.
11. CIL Liable CIL1
12. The applicant is reminded of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 and Environmental Protection Act 1990 wherein the permitted hours of construction work when noise can be audible at a construction site boundary are:

MONDAY TO FRIDAY 8:00am to 6:00pm

SATURDAY 8:00am to 1:00pm

SUNDAY AND BANK HOLIDAYS No work allowed

Any noisy operations outside these hours cannot be undertaken without prior approval of the Environmental Services department and permission is only granted in exceptional circumstances, e.g. emergency works, in which case the Environmental Health Section should be contacted as soon as possible.