

**DAVIS**PLANNING<sup>LTD</sup>

Chartered Town Planners

Members of the Planning Committee  
Surrey Heath Borough Council  
Surrey Heath House  
Knoll Road  
Camberley  
Surrey  
GU15 3HD

9<sup>th</sup> January 2019

Dear Councillor

**18/18A Tekels Park, Camberley**  
**Erection of building to provide 10no. apartments**

I refer to the application at the above mentioned site which is due to be heard at the Planning Committee on 10<sup>th</sup> January 2019 and to the 'Summary of Objections' submitted by local residents.

I act as town planning consultant for the owner and applicant, Lux Homes. Lux Homes are a locally based developer that have already undertaken a number of successful projects within the Borough including the refurbishment and extension of the former job centre along the A30.

The application was the subject of detailed discussions with officers including pre-application discussions and meetings earlier in 2018. Officers welcomed the design principles being put forward and we have acted upon the minor comments which they raised which were primarily related to neighbour amenity and spacing to the neighbouring boundary. As a result, the application is now recommended for approval. In response to the objections which have been raised in the 'Summary of Objections', I would make the following points:

- i) The reference to the building being of a three storey height is correct. However, as there is a significant change in levels towards the rear of the site, the appearance from the street scene will be of a two storey building which we have broken up using changes in the materials;
- ii) Reference has been made to the fact that there are no other 'substantial' apartment blocks on Tekels Park and no flat roof structures. The main point



here is that this is a highly unusual site within Tekels Park as it has a very wide frontage to the street, approaching 150 metres in length. The design has been chosen including its flat roof and contemporary appearance as it is located on the end of a street scene within a substantial plot with a treed setting. We strongly feel that the design, including its flat roof and the materials will complement its setting and therefore do not feel that there would be any conflict with WH2. A management company will ensure that the flat roof and external materials are kept free of litter from the trees and maintained;

- iii) Tekels Park is comprised of a very wide array of building types, designs of various ages and materials and given the extensive size of this plot we feel that an exciting new building would be entirely appropriate. The corten steel finish is only one aspect of the external elevations and has been chosen specifically due to its compatibility with its host environment.
- iv) I'm afraid that we fundamentally disagree with the comments that have been made about the potential for pollution from this material. The project architects have discussed how this can be avoided with the manufacturer and there are three solutions in place, all or some of which can be pursued. It should be remembered that there are only three sections of the building using this material with the remainder being timber and glazing:
  - a)The pre-patination of the panels deals with much of the process and so there is much less chance of contaminated water entering the ground;
  - b)A French drain at the base to catch the run off from the panels and intercepts the stained water and send it to the foul water system;
  - c)Protective coating such as Owatrol Oil which seals the panels;
  - d)Alternative synthetic materials are also available.
- v) The officer's comments in relation to comparing this proposal with the extant permission are concerned with the outward spread of development. There is no suggestion in the officer report that that the extant permission does not have a break in between the buildings. The key point here is that by pursuing a single detached building for apartments, we will be able to provided an open rear amenity area and not a series of smaller plots which are not in keeping with the area. It will also enable the treed areas to be maintained under one single management plan;
- vi) The refence to the upper limit of 9dph is misleading. The key consideration here is the development plan (the 9 dph comes from a supplementary



**DAVIS**

PLANNING<sup>LTD</sup>

Chartered Town Planners

planning guidance) which encourages the efficient use of land particularly in the light of the fact that the Council do not have a adequate 5 year housing land supply;

- vii) The Council's parking standard is being met with the addition of two visitor spaces. There is no evidence that a scheme which is overproviding already will overspill and result in any loss of amenity;
- viii) In terms of the impact on highway safety (Tekels Park is a private road), the highway authority can only consider how a proposal impacts upon the adopted highway. It is normal practice for deliveries and construction parking etc to be dealt with by condition (i.e. a construction management plan). Parking for construction vehicles will be available within the proposed permanent parking area.

In summary, this proposal will not result in the harm alleged. The officers have assessed this proposal at a pre-application and full application levels and found it to be acceptable. They accept that the provision of a single building offers real benefits to landscape management and agree that the principle of a contemporary design in an area with a mixed character would enhance its setting as well as helping to meet an identified housing need and requirement.

Finally, I will be circulating to all members a further visualisation of the proposal to illustrate how it will sit within the site and I expect this to be available tomorrow morning. The officer will have this available for the presentation.

I would therefore urge members to support the officer recommendation to grant planning permission.

Yours faithfully

**Neil Davis**

**Cc All Members of the Planning Committee**