

2018/0605

Reg Date 26/07/2018

Bagshot

LOCATION: LAND WEST OF 94, BAGSHOT GREEN, BAGSHOT, GU19 5JT

PROPOSAL: Erection of 3 one bedroom and 2 two bedroom affordable Passivhaus dwellings, with associated parking, garden areas and landscaping, following demolition of existing garages. (Amended plans recv'd 1/8/2018, 03/10/2018 and 08.10.2018), (Amended plans rec'd 09.10.2018)

TYPE: Full Planning Application

APPLICANT: Mr Jamir Ali
Pan English Developments Ltd

OFFICER: Mr N Praine

This application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, it has been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr Valerie White due to her concerns in respect of; the removal of existing parking, level of proposed parking and highway safety. Cllr White also raises concern in respect of over development of the site, loss of light/sunlight and loss of privacy.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to conditions

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This application seeks redevelopment of an existing garage block located to the end of a cul-de-sac section of Bagshot Green. The site lies adjacent to number 94 Bagshot Green. The site falls within the settlement area and the proposal would provide 3 one bedroom and 2 two bedroom affordable dwellings, with associated parking and garden areas following demolition of existing garages. Each dwelling would have off street parking for one vehicle. The principle of the development is considered acceptable and the development is also considered to result in no adverse harm to the character of the area, residential amenity, ecology, flood risk or the safe operation of the highway/parking levels and is acceptable in all other regards. The delivery of 5 affordable housing units in the context of a shortage of this type of housing at the present time also weighs in favour of the application. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site is an area within the settlement area of Bagshot, of approx. 780m² which is covered by hardstanding with a row of 8 garages along the southern boundary. The application site is accessed from the north and is at the end of a cul-de-sac part of Bagshot Green. The site borders the embankment to the railway line to the west and residential properties to the north and east. To the south there is a public footpath and beyond that, residential dwellings in Waggoners Hollow. There are some large trees to

the rear of the site and a large conifer on the eastern boundary. The site lies within Flood Zone 1. Dwellings in Bagshot Green are two-storey red brick terraced or semi-detached dwellings of similar architectural style, being set close to the road. The existing garage blocks measure an approximate footprint of 22m long by 5m wide and are 2.5m in height.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 SU/17/0716 - Erection of 4 x two bed affordable flats with associated parking and garden areas, following demolition of existing garages, refused, 06/10/2017 for the following reasons:

- *The proposal, by reason of its layout and position within the site, set back from the road and the shape and size of the plot, would fail to sufficiently integrate into the existing character and context of its surroundings. Additionally, the height and design of the roof of the building is considered to be incongruous in the street scene.*
- *The proposal, by reason of its height, position of first floor windows and proximity to the boundary of 94 Bagshot Green and would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for the occupiers of this property and would result in overbearing effects from the rear garden. The development would also result in a material increase in overlooking and loss of privacy for the occupiers of 11 and 13 Waggoners Hollow. The location of the bin store would also be unneighbourly to the occupiers of 94 Bagshot Green*
- *The proposal fails to provide sufficient private amenity space for the occupiers of the ground floor flats and as such would not provide a good standard of amenity for the future occupiers of these properties.*
- *The application was also refused as the applicant failed to make a payment in respect of Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).*

4.0 THE PROPOSAL

4.1 The site layout and design of the dwellings has been altered to respond to the reasons for refusal which arose in respect of the previous scheme under reference SU/17/0716. The current proposal is to still demolish the garages, however it is now proposed to erect two blocks which are labelled on the drawings as 'Block A' to the northern side and 'Block B' to the southern side. The eave heights and roof heights have also been altered to respond to the existing context and windows have been redesigned to reduce the visual impact and opportunities for overlooking.

- Block A would comprise plots one and two with plot one (2 bed) occupying the ground floor and plot 2 (also 2 bed occupying the first floor). This building would be 'L' shaped measuring a maximum of 12m wide and a maximum of 12m deep. This building would have a eaves height of approximately 5.1m and ridge height of approximately 7.4m
- Block B would comprise plots three four and five (all 1 bed units). Plots three and five are proposed to occupy the ground floor and plot 4 the first floor. This building would be more traditionally rectangular although plot 5 (the eastern part of the building) would be set slightly forward and is single storey. Block B measures a maximum of 21m wide and a maximum of 12m deep. This building would have an

eaves height at two storey of approximately 5.1m and ridge height of approximately 7.4m. This is reduced in the single storey section to measure approximately 2.5m to the eaves and a proposed ridge height of approximately 4.5m

- Each plot would have its own private garden space and 5 parking spaces would be provided to serve the development with vehicular access remaining off of Bagshot Green to the north. The public footpaths to the south and west will also be retained for pedestrian access.

4.2 The 'Passivehaus' standard is a standard for energy efficiency in a building, which reduces the building's ecological footprint. It results in a building that requires little energy for space heating or cooling. This includes measures such as very high levels of insulation, high performance windows with insulated frames and airtight building fabric.

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

5.1	Housing Services Manager	No objection – supports the delivery of affordable rented housing on this site
5.2	County Highway Authority	No objection, subject to conditions
5.3	Environmental Health Officer	No objection, subject to conditions
5.4	Council's Arboricultural Officer	No objection, subject to condition
5.5	Windlesham Parish Council	Objection: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Insufficient parking - <i>[Officer comment, see section 7.6 below]</i>• Concern over loss of right of way across site - <i>[Officer comment, see section 7.9.4 below]</i>
5.6	Surrey Wildlife Trust	No objection subject to condition
5.7	Surrey Heath Scientific Officer	No objection subject to condition and informative
5.8	Senior Environmental Health Officer	No objection subject to condition
5.9	Drainage Officer	No objection

6.0 REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 At the time of preparation of this report thirteen letters of objection have been received which raise the following issues:
- Negative impacts on highway safety, loss of existing parking, lack of proposed parking, roads more busy, no turning area for larger vehicles. *[Officer comment, see section 7.6 below]*
 - Inconvenience / increased danger during construction – *[Officer comment, if minded to approve, details of construction management can be agreed via condition]*

- Concern over loss of footpath / right of way across site - *[Officer comment, see section 7.9.4 below]*
- Overdevelopment of site – *[Officer comment, see section 7.4 below]*
- Will cause overshadowing and overlooking of neighbouring properties - *[Officer comment, see section 7.5 below]*
- Future light and noise pollution / nuisance *[Officer comment, this is covered under other, Environmental Health, legislation]*
- Appears to be no justification for affordable housing in Bagshot – *[Officer comment, see section 7.3 below]*
- Will devalue property *[Officer comment: Property values is not a material planning consideration]*

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, CP5, CP6, Policy CP14A, CP14B, DM9, DM10 and DM11. It will also be considered against the Surrey Heath Residential Design Guide 2017 (RDG), saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 (NPPF).

7.2 The main issues to be considered are:

- Principle of the development
- Character
- Residential amenity
- Highways, parking and access
- Impact on infrastructure
- Impact on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA
- Other matters – ecology, contaminated land, flooding, rights of way.

7.3 Principle of the development

7.3.1 At the heart of the NPPF is a requirement to deliver a wide choice of quality homes, and to boost significantly the supply of housing. The NPPF is clear that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Within the settlement area such as this, the principle of residential development is acceptable, and Surrey Heath has a shortage of housing at the present time, and is unable to identify a 5-year land supply for housing as required by the NPPF. In this case, the proposal would result in additional residential units, which accords with these aims of the NPPF.

- 7.3.2 Policy CP5 states that the borough council will seek a target of 35% of all net additional housing as affordable, split between social rented and intermediate. At present Surrey Heath is not meeting its targets in respect of the delivery of affordable housing and as such the principle of units for social rented purposes is supported by Officers and the Housing Services Manager. Policy CP6 requires a mix of housing and this site provides a mix of two and one bed dwellings which are most in demand and as noted above is fully supported by the Housing Services Manager.
- 7.3.3 Principle 6.4 of the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (RDG) SPD 2017 also sets out that housing development should seek to achieve the highest density possible without adversely impacting on the amenity of neighbours and residents or compromising local character, the environment or the appearance of an area (which will be considered below). Therefore and given the absence of a demonstrable 5 year housing supply and lack of affordable housing to meet demand, the principle of the development is considered acceptable, subject to the detailed consideration and balanced assessment of the issues as set out below.

7.4 Impact on character of area

- 7.4.1 Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Paragraph 130 goes on to state that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents. Conversely, where the design of a development accords with clear expectations in plan policies, design should not be used by the decision-maker as a valid reason to object to development.
- 7.4.2 Policy CP2 requires new development to respect and enhance the quality of the environment. 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. Principle 7.1 of the RDG states that setbacks in new developments should complement the street scene and those that erode character and street enclosure will be resisted. Principle 7.3 states that building heights should enable a building to integrate well into its surrounding context and Principle 7.5 states that proposals to introduce roof forms on residential development that diverge from the prevailing character will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that the proposals will make a positive contribution to the street scene.
- 7.4.3 The previous refusal (see paragraph 3.1 above) was not refused due to overdevelopment per se but because of the layout significantly differing from the existing context. The officer's report commented that the four flats to the rear was not in keeping with the existing character of the area i.e. comprising semi-detached and terraced dwellings set in individual plots with long rectangular gardens; and, that flats/maisonettes could be acceptable if the development otherwise integrated well into its context. Moreover, the officer commented that the height and design of the roofs were incongruous.
- 7.4.4 This proposal has sought to overcome these concerns by following the established building line of Bagshot Green with 'Block A' sited adjacent to no.94 and with a comparable height and design. Block A, however, does not strictly follow a linear form with its design turning the corner in a bid to maximise built form. Block A also has a negligible separation distance from no. 94's boundary. Given, however, the separation distances between the proposed flank walls and relationship to the rail embankment to the west it is considered that this site can accommodate such a design. Block A also contains two

private gardens, with access to plot 2's garden not directly from the rear of the plot. This arrangement is not ideal in design terms meaning that in practice the usability of this space would be somewhat compromised. Both gardens serving plots 1 and 2 are small in comparison with existing dwellings gardens on the southern side of Bagshot Green. Nevertheless, nos. 92a and 92 on the northern side of the road also have small gardens and so in respect of this immediate context this arrangement is not objectionable.

- 7.4.5 Block B's maximum ridge height of 7.4 metres is only marginally lower than the previous refusal at 7.7 metres, which was considered unacceptable due to its height. However, unlike the previous refusal this proposal would not be as bulky as Block B would include a bungalow at only 4.5 metres and the two storey element would be closest to the embankment. It is considered that these changes are enough to overcome the previous concerns. Block B is sited a negligible distance from the footpath but the size of this rear garden for plot 4 is considered to be acceptable, albeit its access directly off the footpath is again not ideal.
- 7.4.6 The overall layout actually results in an increase in units compared with the refusal and ideally the optimum number of units on this site would be 2-3 which, in the officer's opinion, would create a more spacious and workable layout that would better integrate into this context. For example, the parking layout is tight and greater separation distances and garden sizes would be preferable. On the other hand the design inventively seeks to maximise the use of the site to deliver much needed affordable units and so in this respect, on balance, the scheme can be supported in character terms.
- 7.4.7 Furthermore, the Passivehaus principles employed by this development can actually enable a tighter layout and form of development. The applicant's Design and Access Statement explains that in architectural terms it is more cost effective to keep the thermal envelope simple. This means avoiding complex building forms, overhangs and large openings. In this respect the architectural design of the buildings both Blocks A and B are at variance with existing Bagshot Road dwellings. However, during the course of the application, the fenestration and proportions of the windows have been improved with amended plans, without losing the Passivehaus principles.
- 7.4.8 There are some large trees along the rear boundary of the site which contribute positively to the street scene and a conifer on the eastern boundary with 94 Bagshot Green. The applicant has submitted an Arboricultural Report, which has been reviewed by the Council's Arboricultural Officer. No trees are proposed to be removed or pruned, and the Council's Arboricultural Officer has not objected, subject to a condition for tree protection and for the development to proceed in accordance with the submitted report.
- 7.4.9 Therefore the overall layout and design of the proposal is now considered to satisfactorily integrate into the established streetscape, without adverse harm to the character of the area, overcoming the previous reasons for refusal. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in character terms compliant with the RDG, Policies CP2 and DM9 and the NPPF in this regard.

7.5 Impact on residential amenity

- 7.5.1 Paragraph 127 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 8.3 of the RDG states that developments should not result in the occupants of neighbouring dwellings suffering from a material loss of daylight and sun access. Principle 8.1 states that new developments which have a significant adverse effect on the privacy of neighbouring properties will be resisted.

- 7.5.2 Proposed Block A would be approximately 3.0m from number 94 Bagshot Green and would broadly follow the same building line, albeit the closest elements of this block would extend beyond the principal front and rear walls of this neighbour by approximately 1m. No first floor facing windows are proposed in Block A and likewise no facing primary windows exist at number 94 Bagshot Green. While Block A does extend to the rear at its western edge, this enjoys a much greater separation of approximately 9.3m. Block B is sited much further away at approximately 14m (single storey section) and approximately 20m (two storey section). In conclusion, given these separation distances and built relationships, no objections are raised in regard to any loss of privacy, any adverse overshadowing or overbearing impacts to the occupiers of 94 Bagshot Green.
- 7.5.3 To the rear of the development lie 11, 13 & 15 Waggoners Hollow, with a footpath and several deciduous trees in between. There would be approximately 20m between the rear elevation of the closest part of Block B and this increases to nearer 25m, given the layout of the properties, (Block A is sited even further away). Having regard for the distance between the elevations of Block B and the closest properties in Waggoners Hollow, the screening and the single storey aspects of proposed Block B, it is considered that the proposal will not give rise to any adverse loss of privacy, overshadowing or overbearing impacts when viewed from numbers 11, 13 & 15 Waggoners Hollow.
- 7.5.4 Block A would be would be approximately 13m from number 92a Bagshot Green, given the separation distances and siting and layout of the existing property number 94 Bagshot Green, it is considered that no new patterns of overlooking are introduced. Block B is sited approximately 30m away. In conclusion, given the separation distances and built relationships no objections are raised in regard to any loss of privacy or any adverse overshadowing or overbearing impacts to the occupiers of 92a Bagshot Green.
- 7.5.5 In terms of the amenities of the future occupiers of the building, the plots have now been given individual private gardens which are of an appropriate size for passive recreation. In addition, given the proximity of the site to the railway line, the Environmental Health Officer has requested conditions in respect of the proposed windows and ventilation, to ensure the properties are not significantly affected by noise.
- 7.5.6 In conclusion the proposal is not considered to conflict with Policy DM9 (Design Principles) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012, The Residential Design Guide or the NPPF in this regard.

7.6 Parking and highway safety

- 7.6.1 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.

- 7.6.2 There are currently 8 garage spaces which are to be lost as part of this planning application. Local residents have understandably raised concerns about this loss of parking and the possible impact it may have. In anticipation of this, the applicant has submitted a Transport Statement (TS) to address these concerns. The TS has reviewed the existing parking capacity within a 200m radius of the application site to include parts of Bagshot Green, Brook Road and Manor Way. The TS identifies that the survey area does not comprise a controlled parking zone (CPZ) and in calculating the number of existing parking spaces, it discounts all vehicle crossovers and kerb space within 7.5 metres of junctions and kerb space where it is too narrow to park on both sides of a road. The TS undertook surveys during peak demand and it therefore identified 59 street parking opportunities within the survey area. Again using this parking survey methodology the TS identifies the average on street parking 'stress' within the identified survey at peak times is 63% (an average of 37 cars have been observed to be parked leaving 22 free spaces during the surveys). Therefore the TS concludes that 8 lost spaces as part of this application could be offset within these free spaces.
- 7.6.3 The Surrey County Council Highway Authority has considered the proposal and in their consultation response is satisfied and raise no objection to the proposal. Additionally the hardstanding and garages are clearly private and not open to cars for general parking. That said, local residents are concerned and therefore and notwithstanding the argument set out at paragraph 7.6.2 above, the applicant also advances that the garages are of old design in which they are only 2.2 metres wide. On this basis it is difficult to use them for car parking on a day-to-day basis. Indeed modern garages are constructed to at least 3 metres internal dimensions, in width, as greater safety requirements and comfort expectations of the motor industry, have caused cars to become wider than they were when these garages were originally built, both in terms of the overall dimensions of the vehicles and the size of the car doors which has an impact when attempting to get out of a car once it is in the confines of a garage. Taking the width of these garages into account it is considered that there is little tolerance for a car to enter and exit these existing garages and further limited room to open a car door and for a person to physically climb out once inside. Therefore the garages are much less likely to be used for the parking of vehicles. Additionally from his own experience the Council's own Housing Services Manager working with the applicant (a housing association) has observed that these older garages tend to be used for storage rather than the parking of vehicles.
- 7.6.4 Furthermore, the applicant owns the garages so letting details are available for these garages and the TS considers the letting details in order to help the LPA understand the impacts of this proposal. The letting details reveal of the 8 garages on the site, 6 are currently rented out. Of these 6 garages only three of are rented out to people living within the parking study area. Therefore the impacts of the proposal are considered to be further reduced by this evidence.
- 7.6.5 Taking all the above information into account and given the proposal provides 1 parking spaces for each unit, the County Highway Authority has also undertaken its own assessment in terms of the likely net additional traffic generation, access arrangements and parking provision and is satisfied with the methodology used within the TS and that the application would not have an adverse material impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining public highway or parking. The Highway Authority therefore has no objections subject to conditions and informatives. County Highway Authority previously raised concern as they considered that insufficient turning space would be present for any large refuse vehicles. However, the applicant has shown a plan demonstrating that there is sufficient turning space, and the County Highway Authority is satisfied.

7.6.6 In summary, the loss of the garage block and parking area are not considered to result in adverse material harm to the safe operation of the highway network and parking standards. The proposal would provide one parking space for each unit, which is in line with the County Highway Authority's parking standards. While no visitor parking has been provided, given the small number of units and the fact that this part of Bagshot Green is some distance from the local school, although concerns have been raised in this regard, the impact of any additional parking is not considered likely to be significant. While the existing garages may be rented out, they are too small to house most modern cars, and the remainder of the hardstanding is clearly private and not open to cars for general parking. As such the loss of the garages is not likely to result in any additional cars having to find parking elsewhere. The proposed development therefore complies with Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

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 Surrey Heath's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule was adopted by Full Council on the 16th July 2014. As the CIL Charging Schedule came into effect on the 1st December 2014 an assessment of CIL liability has been undertaken. Surrey Heath charges CIL on residential and retail developments where there is a net increase in floor area of 100 square metres or more. This development would not be CIL liable however as the housing would be affordable, and this is therefore CIL exempt.

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 640m 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. There is currently sufficient SANG available.

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 would depend on the sizes of the units proposed. This proposal is liable for a SAMM payment of £2078 which has been paid by the applicant.

7.9 Other matters

7.9.1 Policy CP14A requires new development to contribute to the protection, management and enhancement of biodiversity. The Surrey Wildlife Trust has considered the application and raise no objections. While the development is not in an ecologically sensitive area, and given the nature of the existing site is not likely to be of high ecological value, biodiversity enhancement would still be required. It is considered that this could be provided through the use of native species in landscaping, and through bird or bat boxes. This could be secured by condition.

7.9.2 Paragraph 170 of the NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to, and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of pollution. Paragraph 180 of the NPPF states that to prevent unacceptable risks from pollution, planning decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location. The applicant has submitted a Phase 1 desk top study which concludes that there remains potential for contamination, and as such the Environmental Health Officer has requested conditions be attached to the application for further investigation and remediation as necessary.

7.9.3 Paragraph 155 of the NPPF states that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Policy DM10 states that the borough council will expect development to reduce the volume and rate of surface water run-off. The application site lies within Flood Zone 1, and is under 1ha in size. The Drainage Officer has looked at the application and raises no objection, as the level of hardstanding is going to be reduced.

7.9.4 The applicant confirms that the existing public footpath which runs down the boundary of the site adjacent the embankment to the railway line is proposed to be retained. The drawings show this and the closure of this footpath would be a breach of the approved drawings. Additionally the applicant has confirmed in writing that any rights of way will not be lost as part of the proposals.

8.0 CONCLUSION

8.1 The principle of the development is considered acceptable and the development is also considered to result in no adverse harm to the character of the area, residential amenity, ecology, flood risk or the safe operation of the highway/parking levels and is acceptable in all other regards. The delivery of 5 affordable housing units in the context of a shortage of this type of housing at the present time also weighs in favour of the application. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

9.0 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. The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans: 2002-PL B, 2003-PL B, 3001-PL B, 3002-PL B, 4001-PL A, 4002-PL A, 4003-PL A, 4004-PL A, 4005-PL A, 4006-PL A, 4007-PL A and 4008-PL A 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.

4. No additional openings shall be created in this first floor or above elevations without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities enjoyed by neighbouring residents and to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

5. No development shall take place until a Method of Construction Statement, 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
- (d) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway
- (e) hours of construction

has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction period.

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.

6. Prior to first occupation the following will be implemented:

1) Acoustic double glazing providing a minimum sound insulation of R_w+C_{tr} of 28dB is to be installed on all window openings.

2) Any additional means of ventilation, which are fitted to habitable rooms on any elevation facing the railway line, must achieve the same acoustic attenuation as identified in (1) above.

Thereafter the glazing and ventilation details shall be retained unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenities and to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

7. The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the approved plans for vehicles to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. Thereafter the parking and turning areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purposes

Reason: The condition above is required in recognition of the National Planning Policy Framework and to accord with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

8. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied unless and until each of the proposed dwellings are 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 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.

9. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Report prepared by Alderwood Consulting [Johnathan Fulcher] and dated 5 June 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. Development shall not begin until a scheme to deal with contamination of the site has been submitted to and approved 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;
 - (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

Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the development shall be carried out and completed wholly in accordance with the agreed details.

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

11. The development, hereby approved, shall be implemented in full accordance with all the actions which are detailed in the enhancement recommendations within paragraph 5.4 of the above referenced Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. Any deviation from the requirements of the report must be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the changes being undertaken.

Reason: To ensure the protection of protected species in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework

Informative(s)

1. Building Regs consent req'd DF5.
2. Party Walls (etc) Act 1996 DE3.
3. Advice regarding encroachment DE1.
4. Decision Notice to be kept DS1.
5. The developer is reminded that it is an offence to allow materials to be carried from the site and deposited on or damage the highway from uncleaned wheels or badly loaded vehicles. The Highway Authority will seek, wherever possible, to recover any expenses incurred in clearing, cleaning or repairing highway surfaces and prosecutes persistent offenders. (Highways Act 1980 Sections 131, 148, 149).

7. 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.

8. For the avoidance of doubt, the following definitions apply to the above condition (No: 10) 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

Verification of Remediation Report: This shall include:-

- (i) Design, implementation and verification of remediation
- (ii) Validation testing
- (iii) Substantiating evidence
- (iv) Agreement with the Local Planning Authority on verification requirements

9. If a bat is seen during works then, work should cease immediately and advice sought from Natural England or a qualified specialist.

Any external lighting installed on this development should comply with the recommendations of the Bat Conservation Trusts' document entitled "Bats and

Lighting in the UK — Bats and The Built Environment Series".

10. The applicant is reminded of the affordable housing declaration on the completed CIL Exemption Claim form. The Planning Authority will notify you in writing as soon as practicable, confirming the amount of exemption granted. Before commencing the development, you must submit a CIL Commencement Notice to the Planning Authority. This must state the date on which the development will commence, and the Planning Authority must receive it on or before that date. Failure to submit the Commencement Notice in time will immediately mean the development is liable for the full levy charge