

LOCATION: 84 - 100 PARK STREET, CAMBERLEY, GU15 3NY
PROPOSAL: Erection of a part 6 storey, part 5 storey building to comprise 61 sheltered apartments, made up of 28 x 1 bed and 33 x 2 bed apartments, with associated access, parking, stores and landscaping. (Amended plan & info rec'd 30/08/2018) (Amended information rec'd 01/10/2018.) (Amended plan rec'd 07/03/2019)
TYPE: Full Planning Application
APPLICANT: Mr Ziyad Thomas
Renaissance Retirement
OFFICER: Mr N Praine

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to conditions and completion of a legal agreement.

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 The application site lies within Camberley Town Centre to the west side of Park Street and approximately 60m south of the Atrium Shopping Centre. Permission is sought for the erection of a part 6 storey, part 5 storey building to comprise 61 sheltered housing retirement apartments, made up of 28 x 1 bed and 33 x 2 bed apartments, with associated access from Southwell Park Road, parking for 61 vehicles, buggy stores and gardens/landscaping. This would be following demolition of all the existing buildings across the application site.
- 1.2 The principle of residential development in this highly sustainable location is supported given its town centre location and the demonstrated need for residential accommodation of this type. This application has been subject to extensive discussions between officers and the applicants and has also been the subject of detailed consideration by the Council's own Urban Design Officer. The applicant was advised to enter into a Design Review Panel but declined to do so. The design, scale, density, layout and spacing is considered to be appropriate for this location, particularly recognising the importance of the site as one of the main entrances to the town centre from the south of the town. The amenity of surrounding neighbours and future occupiers are considered acceptable and the parking and highway arrangements are also considered acceptable.
- 1.3 Following submission of a viability report, which has been subject to independent review, a financial contribution of £394,480 in lieu of on-site affordable housing has been agreed. The application would also be CIL liable. Subject, therefore, to a legal agreement to secure the affordable housing and SAMM payments, the application is recommended for approval.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 This 0.4 hectare site is located approximately 60 metres south of the Atrium shopping centre to the western side of Park Street, adjacent to the raised and tree lined railway embankment and brick-arched railway bridge to its immediate south. The proposal is also directly opposite (to the east) 'Stokes Lodge' sheltered retirement apartments and to the north east Pembroke House a care home fronts onto Pembroke Broadway. Immediately north of the site residential flats at Marlborough House, 82 Park Street exist. The site also backs onto residential properties in Firwood Drive and to the north west the apartment block Firwood Court. Park Street is one of the major routes into the town centre when approaching from the south of the town when travelling by foot or by vehicle.
- 2.2 The existing red line site measures approximately 60m wide at the front of the site increasing to nearer 100m wide to the rear of the site and approximately 50m deep at its deepest points reducing significantly as the site tapers to the southern side. The land is generally level but does drop gently to the south west and existing landscaping is mostly confined to the rear (west) of the application site with the remainder of the open areas predominantly laid to tarmac hardstanding with some grassed areas to the front of the site. The site currently comprises 4 buildings known as 84, 90, 92 and 100 Park Street which front onto Park Street with ancillary single storey buildings to the rear.
- 2.3 No. 84 Park Street is a single storey building to a maximum height of approximately 5.7m. It also measures approximately 24.5m deep and 15.2m wide. This building is currently occupied by a Wine Warehouse. No. 90 Park Street is a two storey building to a maximum height of approximately 7.5m. This building measures approximately 31m deep and 16.6m wide and is currently occupied by an Estate Agency and other professional / office services. No. 92 Park Street is a two storey building to a maximum height of approximately 7.8m. It measures approximately 11.7m deep and 14.5m wide and this building is currently occupied by a firm of Accountants. No. 100 Park Street is a two storey building to a maximum height of approximately 9.7m. It measures approximately 38.7m deep and 6.2m wide, this building is currently in use as office space. Surrounding building heights vary from the two storey domestic scale in Firwood Drive, to 6 storey height of Stokes Lodge opposite.
- 2.4 Vehicular access is achieved from the rear of the site off of Southwell Park Road, there is also some vehicular access points off of Park Street between numbers 84 and 90 Park Street, 90 and 92 Park Street and 92 and 100 Park Street. There is currently parking for 9 vehicles behind 84 Park Street, 12 vehicles behind 90 Park Street, 11 vehicles behind 92 Park Street and informal parking for approximately 25 vehicles behind 100 Park Street.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 None at application site.

Opposite site:

- 3.2 Stokes Lodge, Park Lane ref SU/12/0562 Erection of a 4 to 6 storey building comprising 40 one bed and 21 two bed sheltered apartments for the elderly to include a warden apartment, with associated communal facilities, guest room, access, parking and landscaping - approved 27/11/12 and implemented.
- 3.3 Pembroke House, Pembroke Broadway ref SU/14/0735 Erection of a 92 bedroom residential carehome following the demolition of existing office building - approved 18/11/14 and implemented.

4.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 Permission is sought for the erection of a part 6 storey, part 5 storey building to comprise 61 sheltered retirement apartments, made up of 28 x 1 bed and 33 x 2 bed apartments over 5895 square metres, with associated access, parking, stores and communal gardens / landscaping.
- 4.2 The proposal will provide secure, self-contained accommodation to meet the needs of independent older people (aged over 60 years in age). The developments are sold on a 250 year lease and managed by the applicant's own retirement management company. The sheltered retirement apartments are designed to provide for the particular needs of their occupiers and typically would provide the following:
- A Concierge to deal with the day to day running of the development,
 - CCTV door entry systems connected to owners' television sets,
 - 24 hour emergency call system fitted in all apartments,
 - communal owners lounge and communal landscaped gardens all regularly maintained and managed by the applicant's own maintenance team,
 - guest suite a twin room for relatives and friends of residents to come and visit (booked through the concierge).
- 4.3 The proposed building would be contemporary in design with materials to include brick matching other brick Edwardian residential buildings in the area, additionally a contrasting organic timber/timber effect boarding is also proposed to be laid vertically to the southern end of the street facing elevation and to the northern end of the rear elevation. The upper 5th and 6th floors would be finished in a metal or composite panel cladding copper brown in colour with a 'speckled' finish. The upper floor is to be set in from the front and rear principal walls therefore reducing its impact when viewed from the streetscape and public vantage points. Artist impressions and street scene elevations have also been provided with the submission to illustrate how the building would appear.

- 4.4 External balconies or private terrace areas are proposed as well as communal terrace and communal garden areas which will include seating areas and planting. The proposed building would have a width of approx. 50.2m and maximum depth of approx. 29m. The height of the building would be approximately 18.5m at its highest points. In addition bin and buggy stores will be incorporated within the main building. All existing trees except one to the front of the site are to be retained and new landscaping is also proposed to enhance the appearance of the development across the site and create a more verdant setting.
- 4.5 Vehicular access is proposed from the existing access to the north west rear side of the site, off Southwell Park Road. This access is shared with Marlborough House, 82 Park Street and Wessex House, 80 Park Street before it joins Southwell Park Road. The access would lead from the highway to a surface carpark for 61 vehicles and a pick up/drop off area by the rear pedestrian entrance. All vehicular access points off Park Street will be closed with only pedestrian access to the building and pedestrian access to the rear car park possible from Park Street.
- 4.6 Following the demolition of the existing buildings, there would be a net reduction of 286sqm of retail floor space, 787sqm of financial/professional floor space, 680sqm of office floor space and 181sqm of ancillary storage building to the rear of the site.
- 4.7 The following documents have been submitted in support of the application of which relevant extracts will be referred to in section 7 of this report:
- Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey and Protected Species Surveys;
 - Statement of Community Involvement;
 - Affordable Housing Statement;
 - Planning Statement;
 - Landscape Design Statement;
 - Design and Access Statement;
 - Transport Statement;
 - Arboricultural Assessment & Method Statement
 - Stage 1 Acoustic Risk Report;
 - Drainage Strategy; and
 - Financial Viability Report.

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- | | |
|---|--|
| 5.1 Council Senior Environmental Health Officer (EHO): | No objections in respect of noise, vibration and air quality, subject to condition <i>[See Paragraph 7.4 below]</i> . |
| 5.2 County Highway Authority: | No objection, subject to conditions <i>[See Paragraph 7.5 below]</i> . |
| 5.3 Viability Consultant: | Comments <i>[See Paragraph 7.8]</i> . |
| 5.4 Arboricultural Officer: | No objection, subject to condition <i>[See Paragraph 7.3 below]</i> . |
| 5.5 Surrey Wildlife Trust | No objection, subject to condition <i>[See Paragraph 7.9 below]</i> . |
| 5.6 Thames Water | No objection subject to informatives and satisfaction that surface water runoff meets relevant standards. <i>[Officer comment, see paragraph 5.8 below]</i> |
| 5.7 Housing Needs Officer | Provided sufficient evidence is given to demonstrate that affordable housing provision cannot be provided onsite, no objection, subject to a financial contribution being provided toward off site affordable housing provision. |
| 5.8 Surrey County Council Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) | Initial objection, however, following submission of additional information no objections subject to conditions. |
| 5.9 Council Scientific Officer: | No objection subject to condition. |
| 5.10 Surrey Police (Crime Prevention) | Recommends Secured by Design accreditation. To be included as an informative. |
| 5.11 Network Rail | No response, consultation period expired. |
| 5.12 Surrey Heath NHS Clinical Commissioning Group | No response, consultation period expired. |
| 5.13 Surrey Heath Urban Design Officer | No objections subject to conditions. |

6.0 REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 At the time of preparation of this report, 21 letters of objection and 3 letters of support have been received. The letters of objection raise the following concerns:
- Negative impact upon the safe flow of traffic and emergency service vehicles *[Officer comment: see paragraph 7.5 below]*

- Loss of office space and shops [*Officer comment: see paragraph 7.2 below*]
- Lack of parking [*Officer comment: see paragraph 7.5 below*]
- Height, width and design is out of keeping with the established character of the area [*Officer comment: see paragraph 7.3 below*]
- Negative impact upon surface water/drainage [*Officer comment: see paragraph 5.8 above*]
- Loss of Privacy [*Officer comment: see paragraph 7.4 below*]
- Overshadowing of neighbours [*Officer comment: see paragraph 7.4 below*]
- Overbearing to neighbours [*Officer comment: see paragraph 7.4 below*]
- The proposal does not comply with the adopted Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (RDG) SPD 2017 or Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 (CSDMP) [*Officer comment: the proposal is assessed against relevant policy below at section 7 of this report*]
- The proposal fails the Building Research Establishment (BRE) 25 degree rule [*Officer comment: the proposal is assessed against the RGD and BRE 25 degree rule below at section 7 of this report*]
- Noise, pollution, disturbance and inconvenience during construction phase [*Officer comment: If minded to approve it would be appropriate to include agreement of a Construction Management Plan via condition*]
- The submission does not include accurate architect's plans for the elevation of the proposed development and hence the proposal cannot be effectively evaluated or built. [*Officer comment: the drawings as submitted are in accordance with the Council's adopted Local Validation List and Guidance for the submission of planning applications*]
- Concerns about air quality [*Officer comment: see paragraph 5.1 above*]
- Increased fear of crime [*Officer comment: no evidence has been submitted as to how crime levels will increase with the introduction of an over 60s sheltered retirement housing complex. Surrey Police have recommends secured by design accreditation and the applicant has agreed to engage with Surrey Police on this matter*]

- Over provision of elderly accommodation/no need [*Officer comment: see paragraph 7.2 below*]
- Devaluing of neighbouring property prices [*Officer comment: not a material planning matter*].

6.2 The letters of support make the following comments:

- A good location of development
- Good design/building has character (subject to timber not fading)
- Appropriate level of parking (one for each flat)
- There is a need for retirement accommodation.

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1.1 The application site is within the settlement area of Camberley. As such the application 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, CPA, CP5, CP6, CP8, CP10, CP12, CP14, DM9 and DM11. In addition, regard must be had to the Camberley Town Centre Area Action Plan (AAP) 2014, the Camberley Town Centre Masterplan and Public Realm Strategy SPD 2015 (PRS). The proposal will also be considered against the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (RDG) SPD 2017, the Infrastructure Delivery Supplementary Planning Document (2014), Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance Strategy (2012) and saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan are also material considerations to the determination of this application. Finally regard is given to the Interim Procedure Guidance Note for Affordable Housing 2012, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the associated Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

7.1.2 The main planning issues, therefore, in the determination of this application are:

- The principle of the development;
- Impact on the appearance and character of the townscape;
- The impact on amenities of neighbouring properties and future occupiers;
- The impact on highway safety and parking;
- The impact on local infrastructure;
- The impact on Thames Basin Heaths SPA;

- Affordable housing and housing mix; and,
- Other matters.

7.2 The principle of the development

7.2.1 Firstly having regard to the loss of the existing commercial uses, the application site does not lie within a designated primary or secondary shopping frontage and therefore the existing A1 Retail and A2 Professional/Financial uses are considered to be more appropriately sited within the these primary or secondary shopping frontages of the Town Centre itself which has floor space vacancies to accommodate these displaced uses.

7.2.2 In respect of the existing business (B1) floor space, Policy TC5 (Employment) of the Camberley Town Centre Area Action Plan (AAP) 2014 states:

‘development resulting in the loss of business floor space will be acceptable where it achieves other Area Action Plan objectives and where this loss will not prejudice the role of the town centre as a centre for employment’.

It is also acknowledged at paragraph 1.36 of the AAP and 5.55 of the CSDMP that there is an established supply of competitively priced and good quality office floor space much of which has been vacant for several years in the Town Centre. The lack of a fast frequent main line rail service to London is a major factor in the decline of Camberley as an office centre. The CSDMP recognises that these offices are unsuited to the needs of modern office users and evidence of long term vacancy rates and changing needs of occupiers suggest that there is currently a reduced need for the current level of office floor space within the town centre. The surplus floor space in vacant premises therefore offers the potential to address other town centre need, indeed the development would contribute to objective 4 of the AAP to enhance Camberley Town Centre’s role as a residential area including the provision of new homes, whilst avoiding harm to European Sites. The development proposal therefore broadly complies with policy TC5 of the Camberley Town Centre AAP, subject to suitable avoidance measures for the Thames Basin Heaths being in place (see paragraph 7.7 below).

7.2.3 Addressing the need for sheltered retirement accommodation, Policy CP6 of the CSDMP sets the Council’s approach to dwelling types. The policy states:

“The Borough Council will promote a range of housing types and tenures which reflect the demand for market housing and need for affordable housing, including accommodation for specialised needs”

The Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA 2016) 2014 - 2032 notes that in line with national trends, the size of the older population has been increasing across the Housing Market Area. Between 2001 and 2011, the older population in Surrey Heath increased by 31%. The projected change in population of older persons (55+) up to 2034 is set to increase by 44% in Surrey Heath. This figure is higher than projected for England. The SHMA 2016 identifies an estimated requirement for sheltered retirement housing in

Surrey Heath to be 1044 units over the period up to 2035, equating to an annualised figure of 50 units. This forms part of the wider requirement for specialist housing for older people in the Borough and the wider Housing Market Area. Since 2014, 79 sheltered units have been completed within Surrey Heath Borough. Therefore, there remains an indicative requirement to provide 965 sheltered accommodation units within Surrey Heath up to 2035. The proposed development would contribute to meeting this identified need.

- 7.2.4 The delivery of housing at a highly sustainable town centre location, such as this, that is within walking distance of the train station and bus links is supported. The proposal would make a positive contribution to the housing objectives based on current and future demographic trends and the needs of different groups in the community. This would have the added benefit of freeing up larger under-occupied dwellings as occupiers move into retirement accommodation. The loss of the existing uses is justified and therefore given the absence of a demonstrable 5 year housing supply and the other reasoning as set out above, the principle of the housing development at this site is considered acceptable, subject to the detailed consideration and balanced assessment of the issues as set out below.

7.3 Impact on the appearance and character of the townscape;

- 7.3.1 Policy CP2 (iv) of the CSDMP is reflective of the NPPF and states that development should ensure that all land is used efficiently in the context of its surroundings. 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. Policy CP10 of the CSDMP and TC1 of the AAP seek to ensure development in the Town Centre is of high quality and is appropriate in terms of scale, quality and quantity.
- 7.3.2 Policy TC11 of the AAP sets out that, new development will be required to make a positive contribution toward improving the quality of the built environment. Where appropriate new development should respect its local context by adhering to continuity of building line; appropriate building heights and use of materials sympathetic to local character. In addition new development should give consideration to the introduction of contemporary materials that respect or enhance existing built form, include a level of architectural detail that gives the building visual interest for views both near and far, make a positive contribution to the public realm facing the street and introduce soft landscaping features where considered appropriate in order to soften the impact of the built environment.
- 7.3.3 The Camberley Town Centre Masterplan and Public Realm Strategy SPD 2015 (PRS) identifies this section of Park Street as falling within the wider Pembroke Broadway 'Opportunity Area'. The PRS acknowledges this area as an important gateway from the south of the town and the PRS explains that the scale of the adjoining buildings, such as Stokes Lodge and Pembroke House, enables greater massing and taller buildings to be considered. However, any proposals for buildings taller than the existing maximum heights should be of highest quality and provide a gateway entrance. The PRS advises that the impact of large blocks should be broken up through the vertical articulation and good design.

Layout, scale and spacing

- 7.3.4 Principles 7.1 and 7.4 of the RDG advise that new residential development should reflect the setbacks, spacing, heights and building footprints of existing buildings. Principle 7.3 sets out that the Council will expect building heights to help enclose the street without overwhelming it. Higher buildings will be more acceptable in tight urban locations such as town centre environments. Building heights will be expected to enable a building to integrate well into its surrounding context.
- 7.3.5 The application site is located at a main route into the Town Centre and currently comprises small scale buildings. The proposal has endeavoured to respond to the layout, scale, spacing and density of the buildings within the Park Street streetscape most notably Stokes Lodge opposite and Pembroke House to the north east. It is acknowledged that the building is taller than the adjoining Marlborough House, by approximately 3m at its closest points, (the fifth floor) and 6m higher (the sixth floor) further within the site away from this neighbouring building.
- 7.3.6 However, the closest elements of the proposal are separated by approximately 4m from Marlborough House, this in combination with the setback of the 5th floor and change in materials for this upper floor would ensure that the fifth floor would not be unsympathetic to the adjoining Marlborough House. The sixth floor is also set back and of different material design. Whilst the proposed 6th floor would be 6m higher than Marlborough House, it is separated by approximately 14.5m from this neighbouring building and as such the changes in height are not considered to result in an adverse relationship between the two buildings given this separation.
- 7.3.7 The proposed building is of similar height to both Stokes Lodge and the proposed building is also separated by approximately 13.5m from the raised tree lined railway embankment and railway bridge. Park Street is the main streetscape in which the building will be viewed in context and while it is acknowledged that it exceeds the two storey scale of the properties in Firwood Drive, given its separation and intervening screening from public vantage points around Firwood Drive the height of the proposal is considered acceptable in respect of impact upon the street scene and public vantage points. The separation and presence of the tree lined railway embankment and arched bridge between the proposals would also ensure a comfortable relationship with the dwellings to the south of the railway. The proposed building has been positioned to respect and reinforce the established building line of Wessex House and Marlborough House, to create an improved frontage to Park Street and this is considered appropriate given the site layout adjacent to this southern 'gateway' entrance to the town centre.
- 7.3.8 The RDG sets out that parking should be safe, overlooked, softened with landscaping and parking should not dominate the street scene, preferably located to the rear (Principles 6.7 and 6.8). Car parking courts should be attractive places with high quality hard and soft landscaping and new hardstanding areas will be expected to be constructed in porous materials (Principle 9.3). The applicant has taken this guidance into account and landscaping is shown on the drawings with surface porous materials to be agreed via condition. The parking is sited to the rear and enjoys overlooking/natural surveillance from the proposed building.

On this basis the officer considers that the development will not be functionally or visually dominated by cars. The parking layout is therefore considered to adhere to the intent of the RDG.

Design, form and detailing

- 7.3.9 The area is characterised by a mix of buildings some set on landscaped plots and others hard up against the street frontage. The proposal is of contemporary design however it also features 'classically ordered' surrey red brick and vertically-proportioned elements in its design as a nod to the Edwardian past. This is contrasted with a softer more curvilinear organic timber boarding to add movement, interest and contrast to the proposed building. The application site is a well trafficked entrance to the town centre from the south and it is fundamental that any design response responds to this character and exhibits high quality architecture in this first impressions 'gateway' location. The design should be carefully considered to create a rational, coherent whole with a visually pleasing balance of proportions. The use of high quality materials is also an added important element in creating an architecturally satisfying development.
- 7.3.10 In this case the proposal has been subject to a number of meetings with planning officers, the Urban Design Officer and the applicant's design team. In this case the applicants have chosen the contrasting materials of timber boarding, to be laid vertically to the southern end of the street facing elevation and to the northern end of the rear elevation, the upper (5th and 6th) floors would be finished in a Metal or Composite Panel Cladding finished in a copper brown with a 'speckled' finish and remaining materials will feature a classical Edwardian orange/red brick reflecting an important link to Camberley's past. This choice in materials serves two purposes, firstly it responds to the existing setting and history of the town centre while introducing its own interest and flair as a new layer in the history of the town centre. Secondly the contrasting materials break up the mass and physical appearance of the building and this is considered further in the paragraph below.
- 7.3.11 This choice in materials gives the building detailing and interest from views near and far. The frontage of the building is also articulated with setbacks, curvilinear rounded edges and contrasting materials. This is considered appropriate to avoid an over dominant or incongruous relationship with the surrounding area. Although the proposed building is contemporary in design with a flat roof form, Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, this should not prevent or discourage appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities). Flat roofs are present at neighbouring buildings such as Stokes Lodge and Pembroke House and the proposal takes its design cues from these buildings. The building is generous in width and height, however, instead of reading as an unrelieved block, the contrast in materials and detailed design provides relief to the eye and adds interest and variation when viewed from the streetscape. This, in the officer's opinion, amounts to high quality contemporary design which responds to its setting and makes a positive statement within this main thoroughfare to the Town Centre.

Given the significant importance of the materials to the success of this scheme, a planning condition can be imposed to ensure that the proposed external materials are appropriate.

Trees and landscaping

- 7.3.12 In the wider context, the area has urban character with landscaping to the front of some sites and no landscaping at all on other sites. In the case of the application site, there is limited landscaping to the front and mature landscaping to the rear. The application is accompanied by Arboricultural Assessment, Method Statement and a Tree Protection Plan. The report advises that only one low quality Lawson Cypress tree to the front of the site requires removing to facilitate the development. This tree is growing within a small area of soft landscape to the Park Street side of the site. The Tree Officer confirms the nature of the species is such that it is unlikely to be allowed to grow into a significant specimen and its useful life expectancy is limited in any event. The redevelopment of the site offers an opportunity to replace this tree with better specimens as part of a cohesive landscaping scheme. The Tree Officer raises no objections subject to the loss of this one tree being mitigated by replacement planting and considers the tree protection appropriate for the remaining trees, subject to a replacement planting condition and full compliance with the submitted tree protection reports. The retention and protection of the remaining existing trees and additional planting will ensure the town centre character of the area is retained.
- 7.3.13 RDG Principle 6.11 states that boundary treatments of at least 1m in height will need to be provided in residential environments to clearly define the boundaries of public and private space. Additionally all boundary treatments in residential developments will be expected to be high quality and reflect the character of the development and the surrounding context. In addressing the west side frontage, low-level dwarf walls, railing and hedges fronting Park Street are proposed creating a formal but 'softened' frontage to Park Street and enclosing the private amenity spaces of the ground floor flats facing that road. Likewise a soft-landscaped shared garden planting beds and terrace areas that wrap around the shared Residents' Lounge, including bench seating is proposed to the rear of the site creating a soft interface between the building and the surrounding area. As indicated above landscaping and surface materials are to be agreed via planning condition.
- 7.3.14 It is therefore considered that the proposed development complies with the design requirements of the NPPF, Policies CP2, CP10 and DM9 of the CSDMP, Policies TC1 and TC11 of the AAP, the PRS, and Principles of the RDG SPD.

7.4 Impact on amenities of neighbouring properties and future occupiers

- 7.4.1 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. Principles 8.1 and 8.3 of the RDG state that, developments which have a significant adverse effect on the privacy of neighbouring properties will be resisted and developments should also not result in occupants of neighbouring dwellings suffering from a material loss of daylight and sun access.

Proposals should also not result in neighbouring dwellings suffering from any adverse overbearing impacts.

- 7.4.2 No.13 Firwood Drive, to the west (rear), is sited closest to the development in Firwood Drive. The dwelling house itself is sited approximately 35m from the closest elements of the proposal. However, a single storey rear conservatory at this property reduces the separation to approximately 32m. That said, the main bulk of the proposed building is sited approximately 39m away from this conservatory (approximately 42m to the main house) as the proposed building has a 11m wide rear projection off of the southern end of the rear elevation which projects toward number 13 Firwood Drive gradually tapering away as it gets closer to this neighbour. In respect to privacy and overbearing impacts, given these separation distances in combination with the mature tree screen which is proposed to be retained, the officer raises no objections on privacy or overbearing impact grounds.
- 7.4.3 Turning to sunlight, it is noted that a 25 degree line taken from 2m above ground level from the rear conservatory would just clip the top of the roof of the proposal. The occupier of number 13 Firwood Drive considers that the proposal is in conflict with fig 8.6 of the RDG in respect of loss of daylighting. This guidance is a starting point and not the only consideration when assessing overshadowing and daylighting. Matters such as the orientation of the properties, any physical screening between the proposals, separation distances and physical design of the properties must be taken into account. In this case the proposal is orientated to the west of this neighbour reducing any possible shadowing to the early morning period, a dense mature tree screen already exists on the shared boundary which will also cast a shadow during the morning period as identified above. As indicated above the main bulk of the proposed building is separated to approximately 39m from this conservatory and 42m from the main house further reducing its impact as just the small tapering rear wing comes toward this neighbour. In addition, the applicant has submitted a sunlight study which shows that whilst the shadows from the proposed building would reach the houses on Firwood Drive and shade rear gardens at 0600hrs, the existing trees and Leylandii between the proposals and the houses on Firwood Drive create a far longer shadow than the proposed building. Additionally by 0900hrs the path of the sun is such that any shadow has moved and is facing northwest of the proposed building away from the properties of Firwood Drive and any shadow continues to travel east as the day continues. On this basis no objections are raised in respect of any adverse overshadowing to this neighbour.
- 7.4.4 The remaining neighbouring buildings in Firwood Drive are sited approximately 42m at their closest points, if not further away (the other closest being numbers 7, 9,11 and 15 Firwood Drive) and for the same reasoning given above at paragraphs 7.4.2 and 7.4.3, no objections are raised in respect to any adverse loss of privacy, overbearing impacts or loss of light to these properties.
- 7.4.5 Firwood Court, Southwell Park Road is located approximately 30m from the proposal at its closest points (i.e. the two corners of each building), with the bulk and mass of the proposal set further away from windows and amenity areas of Firwood Court.

Given the orientation of the two buildings to each other and the separation, it is not considered that the proposal would lead to any adverse loss of privacy, overbearing impacts or loss of light to these properties.

- 7.4.6 Properties to the south of the application site are screened by a tree lined raised railway embankment and are sited approximately 40m away, closest property 97 Park Street, and given this separation distance and screening no objections are raised in respect to any adverse loss of privacy, overbearing impacts or loss of light to these properties.
- 7.4.7 Pembroke House, Pembroke Broadway is located approximately 32m from the proposal at its closest points (i.e. the two corners of each building), with the bulk and mass of the proposal set further away from windows and amenity areas of this neighbour. Given the orientation of the two buildings to each other and the separation, it is not considered that the proposal would lead to any adverse loss of privacy, overbearing impacts or loss of light to the occupiers of this building.
- 7.4.8 Stokes Lodge directly opposite across Park Street to the east, is sited approximately 30m away from the proposal. By reason of the separation and setback of the upper floors the proposal would not cross any 25 degree line as set out in fig 8.6 of the RDG given this separation distance no objections are raised in respect to any adverse loss of privacy, overbearing impacts or loss of light to these properties.
- 7.4.9 The proposal would be adjacent to number Marlborough House separated by approximately 4m. It would not project beyond the front wall of this neighbouring building, but would extend beyond the rear wall by approximately 6m. Given the separation of 4m and the set in of the upper floors, the rear projection beyond this neighbouring wall is not considered to be overbearing or result in any overshadowing to the occupiers of Marlborough House. All windows directly facing Marlborough House are also shown on the drawings as obscure glazed. The primary windows of the closest flats (flat numbers 4 and 8) of Marlborough House, master bedrooms and lounge kitchen areas also enjoy their main outlook to the front and rear of Marlborough House and as such will not be adversely affected by the proposed building. On this basis the built relationships are considered to be appropriate to protect the residential amenities currently enjoyed at Marlborough House in respect of any overshadowing, overbearing impacts or loss of privacy.
- 7.4.10 Given the remaining separation distances to all the other neighbouring dwellings in Park Street, Southwell Park Road, Firwood Drive or Pembroke Broadway, it is considered that the proposed development, as a whole, would be sited at sufficient distance from other neighbouring boundaries and habitable windows to avoid adverse harm to residential amenity.
- 7.4.11 Principle 7.6 of the RDG advises that as a minimum, the Council will expect new housing development to comply with the national internal space standards. The overall floor space provision for each of the proposed flats would meet these minimum space standards.

Principle 8.2 of the RDG advises that all habitable rooms in new residential development should maintain at least one main window with an adequate outlook to external spaces. It is considered that sufficient outlook would be provided for future occupiers of all the proposed units.

- 7.4.12 Principle 8.5 of the RDG advises that developments should provide outdoor amenity space for each unit. In flatted developments, communal open space will be expected. Principle 8.6 of the RDG advises that all flats above ground floor should be provided with balconies and ground floor flats should have access to private amenity space. The proposal complies with these requirements.
- 7.4.13 A noise survey has been provided. The Council's Senior Environmental Health Officer (EHO) has commented that the southern side of the building faces a railway and eastern a reasonably trafficked road. A planning condition is therefore recommended to ensure that minimum specific acoustic performance is provided for windows, vents and balconies. The EHO also is satisfied that vibration from trains and traffic is within acceptable limits. Therefore subject to planning condition no objections are raised.

7.5 Impact on highway safety and parking

- 7.5.1 The Transport Statement states that there would likely be on average nine, two way vehicle trips from the proposed residential apartments during the peak hours 8am - 9 am and six, two way trips during the 5pm - 6pm peak hours. The report also sets that the total number of two way movements would be on average 148 daily. In comparison with the existing uses across the site, there would be a significant reduction in flows of traffic with a net two-way reduction in vehicular trips of minus 25 movements in the peak hours and minus 209 overall daily movements.
- 7.5.2 The existing access from the rear of the site off of Southwell Park Road (shared with Marlborough House and Wessex House) is proposed to be used. The access would lead to a surface carpark for 61 vehicles and a pick up / drop off area by the main rear pedestrian entrance. All other vehicular access points off of Park Street are proposed to be closed off. This is in accordance with AAP Policy TC10 (iv) which seeks to move access to rear service roads and in the interests of highway safety away from the railway bridge (para 7.11 AAP).
- 7.5.3 The proposal provides parking spaces at a ratio of 1 space per dwelling. The Surrey County Council 'Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance' (January 2018) states that the recommended provision is for 1 space per unit. The applicants also provide 6 mobility buggy parking spaces and this is also considered acceptable by both the County Highway Authority (CHA) and planning officers. Whilst no visitor parking is proposed, given the site's highly sustainable location and the age profile of residents where the likelihood is that not all occupants would have cars, the proposed parking provision is considered to be acceptable. The CHA has raised no objections to the proposal, commenting that it has no objections in respect of the wider impact of the proposed development and they consider that the proposal will not give rise to any significant highway issues.
- 7.5.4 The existing access is well established and the CHA consider is acceptable for the proposal. A pre-commencement condition requiring a Construction Management Plan, would be appropriate during the construction period to ensure the highway

network or neighbour amenity is not unduly impacted upon. On this basis, the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the proposal would not conflict with the aims of Policy DM11 of the CSDMP and AAP Policy TC1 (v).

7.6 Impact on local infrastructure

7.6.1 Surrey Heath's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule was adopted by Full Council on 16 July 2014. As the CIL Charging Schedule came into effect on 01 December 2014, an assessment of CIL liability has been undertaken. Surrey Heath charges CIL on residential developments involving one or more new dwellings through new build. The development is CIL liable with the liability calculated as £713,088. CIL is a land charge that is payable at commencement of works. An informative advising of this will be added.

7.7 Impact on Thames Basin Heaths SPA

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. All of Surrey Heath lies within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy SPD 2012 states that no new residential development is permitted within 400m of the SPA. The application site is not within 400m of the SPA but is within 5k and as such new development is required to either provide SANG on site or provided that sufficient SANG is available elsewhere and can be allocated to the development, a financial contribution towards SANG can be accepted, which is now collected as part of CIL. There is currently sufficient SANG available and The financial contribution towards this would therefore be secured via CIL.

7.7.2 In addition to the financial contribution towards the mitigation on likely effects of the proposed development on the TBH SPA in terms of SANG, Policy CP14B requires that all new residential development contributes toward SAMM (Strategic Access Management and Monitoring) measures. As this is not included within CIL, a separate financial contribution towards SAMM is required. In this instance a payment of £26,366 is needed. In order to comply with Policy CP14B and Policy NRM6 and the Thames Basin Heaths SPD, this would have to be paid by the applicant before full planning permission can be granted. This is to be secured in a Section 106 agreement between the applicant and the Council.

7.8 Affordable housing and housing mix

7.8.1 Policy CP6 of the CSDMP promotes a range of housing types and tenures, encourages market housing and generally expects affordable housing. Policy CP5 (and AAP Policy TC4) seeks a 40% on site affordable housing provision for developments of 15 or more units. Policies CP5 and CP6 require viability evidence to be submitted if standards cannot be met and CP5 states that a financial contribution in lieu of provision of affordable housing will only be acceptable where on-site provision is unachievable.

7.8.2 This development would therefore need to provide 24 affordable units on site. However, Policy CP6 also recognises that housing types and tenures are required to reflect the demand for market housing and need for affordable housing, including

accommodation for specialised needs such as retirement accommodation. The applicant has submitted an Affordable Housing Statement. This document explains that the special characteristics and nature of sheltered retirement housing is such that it is not practical or feasible to include an element of affordable housing within the proposed development. The inclusion of family accommodation or accommodation for younger persons would not be compatible with a successful sheltered housing scheme. In addition, by reason of the communal nature of the shared facilities within the development together with the management arrangement for providing a concierge/house manager and services covering regular maintenance of the building, access, parking and communal landscaped gardens.

- 7.8.3 It is accepted that a mixed tenure development, in this instance, would be difficult to accommodate, including facilities such as separate entrances, amenity areas and staffing and management regimes. Any attempt to accommodate a separate block of affordable housing would reduce the amount of units across the site substantially increasing the share of the management charge payable as the cost of maintaining services and facilities would be spread across fewer sheltered housing households. This would also increase build costs potentially rendering the development unviable. The applicant has also provided further evidence from both Registered Social Landlords (RSL's) and management companies who explain that due to the complications associated with the service charge and the cost of providing and maintaining shared communal facilities and staff, RSLs typically are unwilling or unable to take on such proposals.
- 7.8.4 Additionally, a viability appraisal report has been provided by the applicant, which concludes that the proposed scheme would be unviable if it provided affordable housing on site. The Council's own independent viability consultant has formally reviewed this report and has identified a number of potential construction cost savings. Following negotiation, the applicant has offered to provide a financial contribution of £394,480 towards affordable housing. The Council's Housing Needs Officer initially was concerned that onsite affordable housing had not been fully explored, however, following the evidence from the Council's own viability consultants and the reasoning as set out above, the Housing Needs Officer raises no objection and considers that a financial contribution is most appropriate in this case and the figure is agreed by the Council's Viability Consultant. On this basis the contribution is considered acceptable and can be secured through a S106 legal agreement.
- 7.8.5 Policy CP6 sets out the need for housing sizes in the borough and indicates the strongest need for 2 and 3-bed properties. The Issues and Options Consultation Draft of the new Local Plan indicates that for market housing, there is still a strong need for 2-bed and 3-bed properties. While this should be given limited weight at this stage, it is an indicator as to the ongoing need for certain housing sizes. Furthermore, Policy CP6 seeks to respond to the demand for accommodation for specialist needs and typically retirement accommodation demand is for 1 and 2 bed accommodation as family homes are freed up by occupants downsizing into retirement accommodation.

Given the town centre location there is also likely to be considerably less demand from people seeking family accommodation, who tend to be more attracted to family sized houses with private gardens within the local area. In the officer's opinion the proposal is therefore consistent with the aims and objectives of Policy CP6.

7.9 Other matters

- 7.9.1 Any development proposal for new residential development attracting New Homes Bonus payments as set out in Section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act (as amended by Section 143 of the Localism Act) is a local financial consideration which must be taken into account, as far as they are material to an application, in reaching a decision. 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.
- 7.9.2 The LLFA has considered the proposal and after initially raising concerns, the applicant was given the opportunity to submit additional information. The details are now considered acceptable subject to planning conditions in respect of full details of the surface water drainage scheme to be submitted and approved. Once implemented (and prior to occupation) a verification report by a qualified drainage engineer is also to be submitted and agreed to demonstrate the drainage scheme has been constructed as per the agreed scheme.
- 7.9.3 Consistent with paragraphs 91 and 127 of the NPPF, Policy DM9 (v) expects design to reduce the potential for crime and fear of crime. Part Q of the Building Regulations also builds upon the aims of the NPPF. The Police recommend that the development seeks to achieve the Secured by Design award and the contact details of the relevant Police advisors have been passed to the applicant. In the officer's opinion an informative recommending this accreditation would be a proportionate response.

8.0 WORKING IN A POSITIVE/PROACTIVE MANNER

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

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 This proposal would support town centre regeneration and provide housing in a highly sustainable location. The design, scale, density, layout and spacing is considered to be appropriate for this location, particularly recognising the importance of the site to respond to its location as a main 'gateway' entrance to the town centre from the south of the town. The amenity of surrounding neighbours and future occupiers are considered acceptable and the parking and highway arrangements are also considered acceptable. The proposal has the support of the County Highways Authority and has been the subject of independent financial viability review.
- 9.2 In the officer's opinion the proposal complies with adopted policy within the CSDMP, AAP, PRS and supporting RDG. The regeneration of the site is an opportunity to invigorate the town centre approach from the south, to improve the street scene character and to provide a more coherent, safer and more pleasant street environment especially for pedestrians and cyclists. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions, and a legal agreement to secure off-site affordable housing provision and a SAMM payment.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

GRANT subject to completion of a legal agreement to secure an affordable housing contribution of £394,480 and a SAMM financial contribution of £26,366 and the following conditions:

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 building, surface and boundary materials to be used shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. 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. Prior to the commencement of development, the following details must be approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Drawings to a scale not smaller than 1:5 fully showing details of windows, external doors, balcony edges and balustrading, railings, gates, fences, walls and street

furniture. These drawings must show: materials, decorative/protective finish, cross sections, transoms, mullions, glazing bars, formation of openings including reveals, heads, sills. Once approved, the works must not be executed other than in complete accordance with these approved details:

Reason: To ensure that the architectural character of the surrounding area is maintained with regard to Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans: 01 rev A, 010 rev A, 100 rev A, 101 rev A, 102 rev A, 103 rev A, 104 rev A, 105 rev A, 106 rev A, 201 rev A, 300 rev A and 200 rev A (received 7 March 2019) 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.

5. The development shall not be occupied until full details of all hard and soft landscaping works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be also carried out as approved, and implemented prior to first occupation.

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.

6. Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, a Stage 2 Noise Assessment as recommended by the submitted Clarke Saunders Stage 1 Noise Assessment, is to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The report as a minimum must provide specific mitigation measures in respect of windows, ventilation and balconies/terraces in order to satisfy the internal and external noise guidelines within BS 8233:14. Thereafter the details shall be implemented as approved and retained as such 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. 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
 - (d) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway

- (e) on-site turning for construction vehicles
- (f) 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 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.

8. Before first occupation of the development hereby approved the side windows in the north elevation facing Marlborough House shall be completed in obscure glazing with openings as shown on drawing 201 rev A and retained as such at all times unless otherwise agreed in writing with 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.

9. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Report and Tree Protection Plan prepared by Barrell Tree Consultancy dated 23rd July 2018 reference 17360-AA-AN. 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 and Tree Protection Plan. 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. The development hereby approved shall be undertaken in accordance with the recommendations as outlined in the submitted 'Extended Phase 1 Habitat survey and Protected species surveys', author Abbas Ecology, dated December 2017. Additionally:

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

Reason: To ensure the protection of protected species in accordance with Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

11. No trenches, pipe runs for services and drains shall be sited within the Root Protection Area as defined in British Standard 5837: 2012 "Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction" of any retained tree unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the retention of trees in the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

12. 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 above 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), and
- (f) a verification report appended with substantiating evidence demonstrating the agreed remediation has been carried out.

Once agreed, the development shall be carried out and completed wholly in accordance with such details, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA.

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.

13. No demolition, site clearance or building operations shall commence until tree and ground protection has been installed in accordance with British Standard 5837: 2012 "Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction" and as detailed within the submitted Arboricultural Report. Tree and ground protection to be installed and retained during the course of the development.

Reason: To ensure the retention of trees in the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

14. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. The design must satisfy the SuDS Hierarchy and be compliant with the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS, NPPF and Ministerial Statement on SuDS. The required drainage details shall include:

- a) Confirmation that Thames Water has capacity and can accept the proposed discharge rates into their sewer.
- b) Evidence that the proposed solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 & 1 in 100 (+40%) allowance for climate change storm events, during all stages of the development (Pre, Post and during), associated discharge rates and storages volumes shall be provided using a Greenfield discharge rate of 2.7l/s (as per the SuDS pro-forma or otherwise as agreed by the LPA).
- c) Detailed drainage design drawings and calculations to include: a finalised drainage layout detailing the location of drainage elements, pipe diameters, levels, and long and cross sections of each element including details of any flow restrictions and maintenance/risk reducing features (silt traps, inspection chambers etc.).
- d) Details of how the drainage system will be protected during construction and how runoff (including any pollutants) from the development site will be managed before the drainage system is operational.
- e) Details of drainage management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for the drainage system.
- f) A plan showing exceedance flows (i.e. during rainfall greater than design events or during blockage) and how property on and off site will be protected.

Reason: To ensure the design meets the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS and the final drainage design does not increase flood risk on or off site.

15. Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This must demonstrate that the drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme (or detail any minor variations), provide the details of any management company and state the national grid reference of any key drainage elements (surface water attenuation devices/areas, flow restriction devices and outfalls).

Reason: To ensure the Drainage System is constructed to the National Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS.

16. 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, electric buggies and cycles 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 above conditions are required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

17. The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until the existing eastern accesses from the site to Park Street has been permanently closed and any kerbs, verge, footway, fully reinstated.

Reason: The above conditions are required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

18. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied unless and until at least 12 of the available parking spaces are provided with a fast charge socket (current minimum requirement: 7kw Mode 3 with Type 2 connector - 230 v AC 32 amp single phase dedicated supply) in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: The above conditions are required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

19. The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until the following facilities have been provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for:

- (a) The secure parking of at least 10 bicycles within the development site
- (b) Information to be provided to residents regarding the availability of and whereabouts of local public transport, walking, cycling and car clubs.

Reason: The above conditions are required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

20. The occupation of the units hereby approved shall be limited to that of sheltered accommodation for the elderly only. For this purpose elderly is where one or more of the proposed occupants of each dwelling is over 60 years of age, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.

Informative(s)

1. Building Regs consent req'd DF5
2. Decision Notice to be kept DS1
3. CIL Liable CIL1
4. With regard to water supply, this comes within the area covered by the South East Water Company. For your information the address to write to is - South East Water Company, Rocfort Road, Snodland, Kent, ME6 5AH, Tel: 01444-448200
5. For the avoidance of doubt, the following definitions apply to the above condition (No: 12) 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.

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.

6. Party Walls (etc) Act 1996 DE3
7. Advice regarding encroachment DE1
8. If proposed site works affect an Ordinary Watercourse, Surrey County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority should be contacted to obtain prior written Consent.
9. If proposed works result in infiltration of surface water to ground within a Source Protection Zone the Environment Agency will require proof of surface water treatment to achieve water quality standards.
10. When a temporary access is approved or an access is to be closed as a condition of planning permission an agreement with, or licence issued by, the Highway Authority Local Highways Service will require that the redundant dropped kerb be raised and any verge or footway crossing be reinstated to conform with the existing adjoining surfaces at the developers expense.
11. 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)
12. The applicant is advised that as part of the detailed design of the highway works required by the above conditions, the County Highway Authority may require necessary accommodation works to street lights, road signs, road markings, highway drainage, surface covers, street trees, highway verges, highway surfaces, surface edge restraints and any other street furniture/equipment.

13. 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.
14. The applicant is advised to seek a Secured by Design accreditation in addition to the requirements under Part Q of the Building Regulations.
15. The decision has been taken in compliance with paragraphs 38-41 of the NPPF to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner. Further information on how this was done can be obtained from the officer's report.

In the event that a satisfactory legal agreement has not been completed by 31st May, the Executive Head of Regulatory be authorised to REFUSE for the following reasons:

- The proposal fails to provide a satisfactory legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure the proposed financial contribution towards affordable housing. The proposal therefore does not satisfactorily address the requirements of Policy CP5 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.
- In the absence of a completed legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the applicant has failed to comply with Policy CP14B (vi) (European Sites) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and Policy NRM6 (Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area) of the South East Plan in relation to the provision of contribution towards strategic access management and monitoring (SAMM) measures, in accordance with the requirements of the Surrey Heath Borough Council's Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted January 2012).