

LOCATION: LAND 80 GUILDFORD ROAD, BAGSHOT, GU19 5NP
PROPOSAL: Outline application for the erection of a detached 3 bedroom bungalow. Matters of access and layout to be considered.
TYPE: Outline
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Planson
OFFICER: Patricia Terceiro

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. Valerie White, on the grounds that there could be very special circumstances to allow this application due to two recent approvals either side of the site.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 Outline planning permission is sought for the erection of a detached 3-bedroom bungalow within Green Belt land. At this stage, only matters of access and layout are to be considered.
- 1.2 The proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt and conflict with its purposes. Furthermore, the fencing and siting of a dwelling on this land would detrimentally impact on the character of the area. There are no very special circumstances that would outweigh the identified inappropriateness and harm. Therefore, this application is recommended for refusal.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site comprises a roughly triangular shaped piece of land located between the main A322 dual carriage way to the west and Guildford Road to the east. Residential properties lie towards the east of the application and there is a stable building directly to the south. The land is fairly flat (although sloping slightly up from Guildford Road) and the application field is currently free of development and is used for the keeping of horses. The boundary treatment consists of a fence, measuring approximately 1.2m in height. The application site lies within Green Belt land.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 There is no planning history relevant to the proposed development.

4.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 Outline planning permission is sought for the erection of a detached 3-bedroom bungalow. At this stage, only matters of access and layout are to be considered. Whilst scale, appearance and landscaping would be reserved matters the applicant has submitted indicative plans indicating a footprint of 11.8 m by 14.5 m and maximum height of 5.2.
- 4.2 The proposal would comprise creating a new access point off Guildford Road, located next to the site's south-eastern corner. The layout shows one bungalow which would have its front elevation facing towards the south, where there is currently a stable building. Vehicle parking would be provided to the front of the bungalow, within the area directly in front of the proposed access to the site.
- 4.3 The applicant's Planning Statement provides a case for very special circumstances. The application is also supported by a Noise Exposure Assessment and Air Quality Impact Assessment.

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------|--|
| 5.1 | Surrey County Highway Authority | No objections. |
| 5.2 | Environmental Health Service | No objections, subject to planning conditions. |
| 5.3 | Windlesham Parish Council | No objections. |

6.0 REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 At the time of preparation of this report one letter of representation has been received supporting the application.

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 The application site is located in Green Belt land, as set out in the Proposals Map of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 (CSDMP). In this case, consideration is given to Policies CP1, CP2, CP3, CP6, CP12, CP14B, DM9, and DM11 of the CSDMP. The Residential Design Guide (RDG) SPD 2017 also constitutes a material planning consideration. Finally, the proposal will also be considered against the principles of protecting the Green Belt land, in accordance with Section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 7.2 The main issues to be considered within this application are:
- Principle of development and impact upon the Green Belt;
 - Impact on character of the area, including trees;
 - Residential amenity;
 - Transport and highways considerations;
 - Impact on infrastructure;

- Impact on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA;
- Very Special Circumstances

7.3 Principle of the development and impact on the Green Belt

- 7.3.1 Policy CPA of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document (CSDMP) 2012 seeks sustainable development within the Borough. This policy states that new development will come forward largely through redevelopment of previously developed land. Policy CP3 sets out the overall housing provision targets for the Borough for the period 2011-2028 and Policy CP6 promotes a range of housing types and tenures.
- 7.3.2 Paragraph 143 of the NPPF sets out that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Therefore, and as per paragraph 144, the Local Planning Authority should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. Paragraph 145 of the NPPF states new buildings are inappropriate in the Green Belt but lists exceptions to this.
- 7.3.3 The proposal meets none of the exceptions under paragraph 145 of the NPPF and therefore constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt.
- 7.3.4 While the submitted layout is indicative, it is acknowledged that the applicant has attempted to address the development's impact in the Green Belt by proposing a single storey building with a hipped roof. However, this would still constitute an increase in volume and bulk of built development on the site, given that it currently comprises undeveloped land. Consideration is further afforded to the 2m high acoustic fence (which would have to be erected on the site's boundary adjacent to the A322, in order to protect the residential amenities of the bungalow's future residents), which would constitute additional built form on site. The change over the existing situation would therefore be appreciable and the proposed scheme would make an obvious and detrimental difference to the openness within this area.
- 7.3.5 It is therefore necessary to consider whether any other harm exists, in addition to the Green Belt harm. The following paragraphs consider this with conclusions on whether very special circumstances exist at the end of this report.

7.4 Impact on the character of area

- 7.4.1 Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document (CSDMP) 2012 promotes high quality design. Development should respect and enhance the character of the local environment and be appropriate in scale, materials, massing, bulk and density. Policy CP2 states that new development should use the land efficiently within the context of its surroundings and respect and enhance the quality of the urban, rural, natural and historic environments.
- 7.4.2 The RDG provides further guidance relating to the design of residential developments. In particular, Principle 6.6 sets out that new residential development will be expected to respond to the size, shape and rhythm of surrounding plot layouts. Proposals with plot layouts that are out of context with the surrounding character will be resisted. Principle 7.4 refers that new residential development should reflect the spacing, heights and building

footprints of existing buildings. Principle 9.1 goes on to say that all boundary treatments in residential developments will be expected to reflect the character of the development and the surrounding context.

- 7.4.3 The streetscene of Guildford Road within this area consists of detached dwellings set in plots of land to different shapes and, to this regard, it is not considered that the proposed bungalow on its own would appear adversely out of keeping with its surroundings as such. However, it is noted that this plot would be sited in an odd location for a residential use, given that it is surrounded by public highways, the most significant of all being the A332, adjacent to the site's western boundary.
- 7.4.4 By virtue of the site's location adjacent to the A332, the Environmental Health Service has recommended that, on the site's boundary adjacent to this road, a 2m high acoustic fence is installed for residential amenity purposes. Furthermore, it is noted that the plans submitted with this application indicate the applicant's intention to enclose the site with a 2m high fence. The proposal would therefore provide a long length of unrelieved hard boundary treatment to the public realm, extending across three different boundaries, which would in addition occupy a highly prominent within the streetscene and ultimately have a detrimental impact on the character of this area.
- 7.4.5 The justification to install the above mentioned fence highlights the inappropriateness of the application site for a residential use. The application site is contrived and the proposal would further exacerbate this, given the plot's triangular shape and resulting relationship with the bungalow's large footprint. As such, it is considered that the proposal would result in an urbanisation effect that would ultimately have a detrimental impact on the character of this area.
- 7.4.6 In light of the above, the proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CP2 and DM9 of the CSDMP.

7.5 Impact on residential amenity

- 7.5.1 Policy DM9 of the CSDMP 2012 states that development should respect the amenities of the adjoining properties and uses. Section 8 of the RDG advises, through Principles 8.1 and 8.3, that new residential development should not have a significant adverse effect on the privacy, loss of daylight and sun access to neighbouring properties. Principle 7.6 recommends that new housing complies with the national internal space standards.
- 7.5.2 The proposal's impact on the residential amenities of the adjoining properties would be assessed at reserved matters stage, when final details regarding the siting and appearance of the proposal would be finalised. In any instance noting the proposal's single storey height and separation distance to the adjoining dwellings, it is not considered that the proposal would be unduly overbearing, detrimentally overshadow or overlook the nearest residents.
- 7.5.3 In terms of the amenities of the future occupiers of the dwellinghouse, it is noted that the application site is adjacent to a dual carriageway and, as such, there would be concerns with matters as air quality and noise. The applicant has submitted the relevant assessments to address this, which have been assessed by the Environmental Health Service. Subject to the planning conditions including, for example, a 2 m high acoustic boundary fence (albeit this solution would have an urbanising effect and be harmful to countryside character) and acoustic glazing the proposal would be considered acceptable.
- 7.5.4 As such, the proposal would not be considered to affect the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties and would be in accordance with Policy DM9 of the CSDMP and the RDG.

7.6 Parking and access

- 7.6.1 Policy DM11 states that development which would adversely impact the safe and efficient flow of traffic movement on the highway network will not be supported by the Council, unless it can be demonstrated that measures to reduce such impacts to acceptable levels can be implemented.
- 7.6.2 The proposed development has been considered by the County Highway Authority who raise no concerns provided that planning conditions requiring that vehicular access, parking spaces and fast charge socket are provided prior to occupation of the development. In the event of planning permission being granted for the proposal, it is therefore recommended that these conditions are added.
- 7.6.3 The proposal is therefore in line with Policy DM11 of the CSDMP.

7.7 Impact on infrastructure

- 7.7.3 As the proposed development would involve the provision of an additional residential unit, the development would be CIL liable. The site falls within the Eastern Charging Zone, for which the charge is £220 per m², for residential development that does not provide its own SANG. As such, an informative has been added to this recommendation, should planning permission be granted for the proposal.
- 7.7.4 It is therefore considered that the proposal would be in accordance with Policy CP12 of the CSDMP.

7.8 Impact on Thames Basin Heaths SPA

- 7.8.1 Policy CP14B of the CSDMP 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 Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) sited within the Borough. The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy SPD (2012) identifies Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) within the Borough and advises that the impact of residential developments on the SPA more than 400m away from the SPA can be mitigated by providing a financial contribution towards SANGS.
- 7.8.2 There is currently sufficient SANG available and this is collected via CIL. This development would be CIL liable, so a contribution would be payable on commencement of development. 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 would depend on the sizes of the units proposed. This proposal is liable for a SAMM payment, which would be requested at reserved matters stage.
- 7.8.3 It is therefore considered that the proposal would comply with Policy CP14B of the CSDMP and with the SPD.

7.9 Very Special Circumstances

- 7.9.1 The applicant acknowledges that the development would be considered inappropriate in light of the NPPF and, as such, the submitted Planning Statement sets out very special circumstances, which are considered below.

- 7.9.2 a) Security: the application site is severely vulnerable to crime and potential incursion from unauthorised occupation. Additionally, the proposed dwelling would provide natural surveillance over the stables.

However, this would not be supported by any evidence suggesting that this would be the case and, furthermore, it is considered that security on site could be increased by installing CCTV cameras, or other security measures. There is no justification for the erection of a building for security purposes and as such very limited weight is given to this argument.

- 7.9.3 b) Fly tipping and rubbish: the site is vulnerable to rubbish, including large items being dumped on site. The proposed development would secure the site and prevent this problem.

Similarly to the above, no specific details have been provided and, as such, this does not justify built form. Again very limited weight is given to this argument.

- 7.9.4 c) Quality of the Green Belt: due to its location, the site would offer very little in protecting the openness of the area, as the existing road network would assist in preventing the spread of development.

Openness means the absence of development and as already explained in section 7.3 of this report this proposal would be harmful to openness. The applicant's argument could be repeated on other sites in the Green Belt and enabling development at this location would weaken the integrity of the Green Belt. Therefore limited weight is given to the applicant's argument.

- 7.9.5 The proposal would provide one additional dwelling to contribute to the housing supply within the Borough and that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing supply. However, this application refers to a single dwelling which would make little difference to this matter. The small benefit of allowing one single dwellinghouse is clearly outweighed by the substantial Green Belt harm.

- 7.9.6 While each application is assessed in its own merits, it is noted that a new residential development has been recently allowed in the site's proximities (Kennels, 79 Guildford Road, to the north of the application site). However, this was allowed as it represents a complete redevelopment of previously developed land that would have no greater impact on openness than the existing mixed use of the site with its built form and associated hard standing. The circumstances are therefore materially different and, as such, the grant of this application does not constitute any very special circumstance that would weigh in favour of this current application.

- 7.9.7 As such, alone and in combination, there are no very special circumstances to outweigh the identified harm.

8.0 **POSITIVE/PROACTIVE WORKING**

In assessing this application, officers have worked with the applicant in a positive, creative and proactive manner consistent with the requirements of paragraphs 38 to 41 of the NPPF. This included the following:

- a) Provided or made available pre application advice to seek to resolve problems before the application was submitted and to foster the delivery of sustainable development.

b) Provided feedback through the validation process including information on the website, to correct identified problems to ensure that the application was correct and could be registered.

c) Have proactively communicated with the applicant through the process to advise progress, timescale or recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reason(s):-

1. The proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt by not meeting any of the exceptions under paragraph 145 of the NPPF; and, by reason of its layout and siting on undeveloped land, its indicative size including its floor area and volume would result in a quantum of built form that would be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt and conflict with its purposes. In addition, the proposed 2 m high acoustic fencing would result in an urbanising effect that would further harm the Green Belt. There are no very special circumstances that would outweigh the identified Green Belt inappropriateness and harm (including the harm identified in reasons for refusal 2). The proposal is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed dwelling by reason of its layout and siting, together with the proposed 2 m high acoustic fencing, would result in a contrived and incongruous form of development that would have an urbanising effect and be harmful to the character and quality of the area, contrary to Policies CP2 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

Informative(s)

1. Decision Notice to be kept DS1
2. Advise CIL Liab on Appeal CIL3